The Communist

20c SEPTEMBER 1944

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST ORGANIZATION

BROWDER • MINOR • LANDY

•

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

FOSTER DENNIS

BUDENZ WILKERSON

•

CHINA'S REAL DESTINY

FREDERICK V. FIELD

•

WALTER LIPPMANN'S "U. S. WAR AIMS" REVIEWED

HANS BERGER

SURPLUS DUPLICATE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Three August Publications

MORALE EDUCATION IN THE AMERICAN ARMY

BY PHILIP FONER

In this new study, a distinguished American historian brings to light a wealth of material, including documents and speeches by Washington, Jackson and Lincoln, letters from soldiers, contemporary newspaper articles and editorials, resolutions and activities of workers' and other patriotic organizations backing up the fighting fronts, all skillfully woven together to make an illuminating analysis of the role of morale in the three great wars of American history—the War of Independence, the War of 1812, and the Civil War.

Price 20¢

MARX AND ENGELS ON REACTIONARY PRUSSIANISM

An important theoretical study which assembles the writings and opinions of Marx and Engels on the historical roots, character and reactionary political and military role of the Prussian Junkers, and illuminates the background of the plans for world domination hatched by the German general staff, the modern industrialists and the criminal Nazi clique.

Price 20¢

WALT WHITMAN—POET OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

BY SAMUEL SILLEN

A new study of the great American poet, together with a discerning selection from his prose and poetic writings which throws light on Whitman's views on the Civil War, democracy, labor, internationalism, culture, etc.

Price $1.50

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Sta. D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XXIII, No. 9 SEPTEMBER, 1944

THE COMMUNIST

A MARXIST MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO ADVANCEMENT OF DEMOCRATIC THOUGHT AND ACTION

EARL BROWDER, Editor EUGENE DENNIS, Associate Editor

V. J. JEROME, Managing Editor

CONTENTS

Labor Day in 1944	*An Editorial*	771
Some Features of Modern Warfare	*Maj. Gen. M. Galaktionov*	773
The Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Founding of the American Communist Organization	*Resolution of the National Convention, C.P.A.*	778
What Marxism Contributes to America	*Earl Browder*	782
The Heritage of the Communist Political Association	*Robert Minor*	788
A Lesson in Democracy	*A. Landy*	798
A Resolute Non - Partisan Policy to Strengthen National Unity	*Eugene Dennis*	806
Notes on the Democratic Convention	*Louis F. Budenz*	813
The Negro and the Elections	*Doxey A. Wilkerson*	819
China's Real Destiny	*Frederick V. Field*	830
A Company Union of Nations?	*Hans Berger*	846
Resolutions Adopted by the National Convention, C.P.A.		857
Historic Documents		862

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. THE COMMUNIST is published Monthly by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y. (mail address, P. O. Box 148, Station D), to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the War and the 1944 Elections

YOUR STAKE IN THE 1944 ELECTIONS, by Adam Lapin ..... $.05

The issues in the coming Presidential elections analyzed by a veteran political journalist.

THE ROAD AHEAD, by Earl Browder ..... .10

Speeches by the President of the Communist Political Association at its constituent convention.

IS DEWEY THE MAN?, by Sender Garlin ..... .05

An expose of the record of the G.O.P. presidential nominee, the forces backing him and their connections.

WHAT DOES THE C.T.A.L. MEAN? by Vicente Lombardo Toledano ..... .10

The history, structure, role and program of the powerful Confederation of Latin American Workers, outlined by its president.

SOVIET FARMS AND THE WAR, by Anna Louise Strong ..... .10

How Soviet agriculture met the stern test of the war as told by one of the foremost authorities on Soviet life and culture.

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Sta. D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOR DAY IN 1944

AN EDITORIAL

ON THIS Labor Day American organized labor indeed faces a most crucial period in the life of the labor movements of our nation and of the world. The hard war against the fascist aggressor powers is rapidly approaching a victorious climax for the United Nations. As these lines are being written, Paris has just been reported liberated; the American, British and French forces are advancing toward Germany's borders from the north and south of France; and on the Eastern Front the Red Army has dealt Hitler another staggering blow by knocking Rumania out of the war as a Hitler satellite. In the Pacific, too, the war is going ahead successfully, as indicated by the ever-increasing cries of alarm coming from the frightened war lords in Tokio.

In our own country, the Presidential election is speeding on to its November climax. This historic election will determine whether or not the United States Government will put its great power behind the fulfillment of the decisions of the Teheran conference, with all their national and international implications. Supporting the candidacy of Roosevelt and Truman are massed those great democratic forces which, on the basis of the Teheran policies, would help speed victory over fascism and the establishment of a lasting peace; whereas, behind the candidacy of Dewey and Bricker are the most reactionary forces in American life, those that would break down the work of Teheran and commit our country to a reckless policy of imperialist adventure. Undoubtedly, the vast majority of the people stand behind the Roosevelt policies, and, if they can be brought out to vote in November they will return the present Administration to office. The chief hope of the Dewey forces is to keep as many as possible of the great democratic masses away from the polls, by lulling them into believing that there is a basic "area of agreement" on all major issues between the two parties, by disfranchising the soldiers from voting, by preventing the registration of war workers, and by similar maneuvers.

The first great thing is to help win the war, quickly and decisively. This means to keep war production at the maximum; which also means the strict enforcement of the no-strike pledge of organized labor. All attempts to break down this pledge, whether from the provocative action of reactionary employers or from the propaganda of treasonable

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lewisites and Trotskyites, must be completely defeated. There are also the big tasks of organizing the peace, not the least of which is the great job of reconverting our industries. Here the central task is to enact into law the provisions of the Murray-Kilgore Bill in order to prevent wholesale unemployment in the change-over period immediately after the defeat of Germany. It is also necessary to keep the Hoover-Dewey reactionaries from exploiting the possible widespread unemployment politically, by trying to panic the people with the demagogy that President Roosevelt has plunged the country into an economic crisis.

The outcome of all these tasks depends on the efforts of labor and the people to secure victory in the Presidential elections by the re-election of Roosevelt and a win-the-war Congress. The organized labor movement must display greater political activity than ever before in its history. And this is what it is now beginning to do, especially the C.I.O. The A. F. of L. Executive Council has, however, refused to endorse Roosevelt, under the pretext of continuing the non-partisan policy of Gompers. The Executive Council's non-endorsement policy is contrary to the wishes of the great bulk of the A. F. of L. members. Many of the biggest A. F. of L. unions, state federations and local labor councils, totaling a decisive majority of the whole Federation membership, have declared their support for Roosevelt's re-election.

In facing up to the huge tasks of the period lying before it, organized labor stands in urgent need of unity, nationally as well as internationally. But the controlling leaders of the A. F. of L. still cling to the harmful notion that they have to fight the C.I.O., rather than to cooperate with it. Thus, in a recent letter to all A. F. of L. affiliates, William Green called upon them to "cease and desist" from collaboration with the C.I.O. politically. This order is outdone by the fulminations in a recent issue of the A. F. of L. *News Letter*, charging the C.I.O. with trying to "buy" the elections, and denouncing it as "the strongest anti-labor force" in the country. It is fortunate, however, that such attitudes and ideas do not represent the sentiments of the mass of the A. F. of L. members, who are largely aware of the folly of fighting the C.I.O. and want to cooperate with it for the election of Roosevelt.

The winning of the war, the smashing of fascism, the elaboration of a post-war organization to keep the peace, the consolidation of a truly democratic government in the United States, will open up to the trade unions and to the whole American people opportunities for freedom and prosperity such as they have never had before. But if labor fails to meet its responsibilities in achieving these great goals, then, in common with the rest of our people, it will stand exposed to reactionary dangers of the gravest sort.

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME FEATURES OF MODERN WARFARE *

BY MAJ. GEN. M. GALAKTIONOV

THIRTY years ago piratical German imperialism unleashed the First World War, with world domination as its aim. The rulers of imperial Germany and their general staff made long and careful preparations for that war and reckoned on terminating it swiftly by defeating France, Russia and England in quick succession. However, even in the first few months a fatal defect of German strategy was revealed, namely, crass overestimation of Germany's strength and underestimation of the strength of her opponents.

The Battle of the Marne and the Russian offensive in East Prussia led to the collapse of the Germans' plans and the protraction of the war. This in turn led to an increasing change in relative strength in favor of the Allies and to the detriment of Germany, which began to feel all the handicaps of a war on two fronts.

In 1918 the German army, large forces of which were contained in the East by Soviet Russia, was defeated by the combined armies of England, America and France. Germany was vanquished in the field, but the victors failed to reap the full fruits of their decisive triumph. The "appeasement" tendencies which at one time dominated West European policy enabled the Germans to prepare for and launch a second World War.

Hitler and his clique, whose aim was to bring all human society under German domination, first turned their war machine against the countries of Western Europe and registered a number of major successes. Then Hitler Germany treacherously attacked the Soviet Union. The Red Army administered a series of defeats to the German-fascist armies which radically changed the course of the war. By the combined blows of the Red Armies and the Allied Armies, Nazi Germany has been brought to the brink of disaster.

The second World War is nearing its end. In the past thirty years we have known two world wars, the experience of which furnishes a foundation for the modern science of warfare. But the question arises: is it right to draw general conclusions from two wars that in many respects differ so radically? In other words, how instructive are the lessons of the first World War today?

* Reprinted from *Krasnaya Zvezda* (*Red Star*) of August 1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The answer to this question was furnished in the course of this war. The Nazi adventurers, while they exploited for their criminal war a number of advances in armaments —advances which, incidentally, did not originate in Germany—actually speaking, had no scientifically grounded system for conducting operations.

Failure of Blitzkrieg

The Nazis rejected positional warfare in favor of blitzkrieg. But the German armies, attacking with the aim of inflicting lightning defeat on the Soviet Union, were beaten by the Red Army. Thereupon the Hitlerites changed their line, rejected blitzkrieg and espoused positional warfare. Again the Germans were defeated by the Red Army. These fluctuations, incidentally, show that Hitler and his clique crudely misinterpreted the lessons of the war of 1914-18.

But to show where they blundered, we will deal with some of the features of the first World War.

The first distinguishing feature, which manifested itself in the very early stages of the war, when it still bore a maneuvering character, was the fire power resulting from quantitative and qualitative development of artillery and firearms of all types. Most striking of all was the use of fire power as a means of defense, largely due to the development of automatic firearms. The heavy machine gun, with its faculty for creating a solid and impenetrable zone of fire, became the chief means of defense of fortified fronts. Flanking machine-gun nests in the forests of Caillet, on the heights dominating the approaches to Fort Veau, kept the Germans besieging Verdun at bay for several months. The pillbox or concrete firepost likewise originated in Verdun. For many weeks German artillery was unable to locate and destroy these tiny points. Machine-gun fire was supplemented by artillery barrage. The attacking infantry sustained immense losses and in many cases was unable to reach the enemy's first line of trenches.

War Assumes Positional Character

The effect was to create solid and stable fronts traversing the entire theater of hostilities and behind which the infantry and artillery were ensconced. The war assumed a positional character. Both belligerent sides sought persistently for a way of breaking through into the open and passing to the tactics of movement. An attempt was also made to adapt fire power for offensive purposes, especially the faculty of artillery for demolishing defenses and opening the road for the attacking infantry. Thus arose the tactics of break-through.

Considerable experience was accumulated in the war of 1914-18 in the art of preparing for the carrying out of break-throughs. The concentration of powerful artillery forces, artillery preparation, new methods of firing and creeping barrage were all evidences of the swift development of this powerful arm.

In the first World War considerable difficulty was encountered in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

developing tactical success into operational success. But here, too, the beginnings of a solution were found, the full development of which, however, remained a matter for the future. In 1916 the first tank appeared on the battlefield, and in 1918 the Allies launched their offensives with the help of hundreds of tanks and the support of "air divisions."

German war doctrine failed to understand these features of modern warfare. It was extremely one-sided. The Germans' conception of the difference between the first and second World Wars is very primitive. They held that the first war was exclusively one of position, but that the second was a war of maneuver in which fortified fronts play only a secondary role. They overlooked the fact that a fortified front, and hence fire power, artillery and infantry, played an outstanding part in the first war and that these features would be inherited by the second. They believed that the decisive factor of this war would be mobile formations.

The Red Army drew the correct conclusions from the experience of the first World War. Stalin's school of strategy taught that the form of maneuver that arose in the first World War would be broadly developed; hence the place of honor assigned to tanks and aircraft in our Army. On the other hand, it taught that such features of the first war as fire power, fortified fronts and the necessity of breaking through these fronts would also play a prominent part in the coming war. This explains why mobility and weight of numbers in fire power and maneuver are properly combined in the Red Army, why its artillery received such all-round development and why the fire power of the Army increased generally, and why such importance is attached to the infantry. The first World War was not exclusively a war of position; it originated the modern maneuver. The second World War is principally a war of maneuver, but maneuver combined with powerful fortified fronts. This difference in the character of the two wars was properly appreciated by the Stalin school of strategy.

Now that we can look back on five years of the second World War, we are able more deeply and correctly to appreciate the experience of the last war. Fire power, fortified fronts and the break-through—those three principal features of the war of 1914-18—have been preserved in this war. This war further developed these features which, in fact, are characteristic of modern warfare generally.

It was already held in the first World War that the break-through, when exploited and consummated, leads to the war of maneuver. This has been corroborated in the present war, not by the Germans, however—who gained their victories at a time when the features of the present war had not yet fully manifested themselves—but by the Red Army in its grand offensive in 1942-44 when fortified fronts already existed.

The tank owed its inception to the positional warfare of 1914-18.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Its armor was designed to protect troops from machine guns and its tracks for movement over battlefields criss-crossed by trenches, pitted with shell craters and covered with barbed wire entanglements. The tank became the instrument of maneuver in its new and higher form. The development of tank and mechanized troops capable of exploiting a break-through and conducting maneuvering operations in depth is a new feature of this war as compared with the last.

Another new feature is the extremely rapid and far-reaching development of aviation which, being able to cross fortified lines, attack the adversary's deep rear and strafe installations and troops on the battlefield, is radically changing the methods of warfare.

The gigantic fortified front stretching from the Barents Sea to the Gulf of Finland, from the Baltic to the Carpathians and from the Carpathians to the Black Sea is in itself convincing evidence that the fortified line which appeared in the first World War retains all its significance today. Moreover, the front of the German defenses now pierced and demolished by the Red Army was constructed in accordance with all the rules of field fortification, which have made big strides as compared with the first World War. Fire power has been increased many times over. Pillboxes and bunkers have been supplemented by anti-tank guns, minefields and obstacles of diverse types. Defense zones now measure scores of kilometers in depth instead of only a few kilometers as in the last war. Furthermore, strong points and fortified lines were prepared deep in the rear.

This powerful defense system was smashed by the Red Army. Of the many achievements of the Soviet science of war, special mention should be made of the supreme skill of our troops in penetrating the enemy defenses. The prime part in this is played by the artillery. A new feature compared with the last war is the combination of fire power and mobility which enables the artillery to escort attacking troops into the depths of the enemy's defenses. Another new feature is the combination of massed artillery and air attacks. Soviet infantrymen armed with tommy guns and light machine guns and escorted by tanks, guns and mortars, solve with consummate skill the most difficult problems which arise in the course of attack and exploitation in depth. Penetrating a defense zone to a depth of 10 or 15 kilometers on the first day of an offensive has become the customary rate of advance of our gallant troops.

Brilliantly executed breakthroughs on a number of sectors of the German front served as a prelude to that magnificent cascade of operations which has astonished the world. One's attention is baffled by the swiftness of the Red Army's westward march and is unable to register all the landmarks in the triumphant onward sweep. The mind therefore fails to appreciate the grandeur of the problems solved by Soviet troops in their great offensive.

And in connection with this anni-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

versary it would be well to remember that the Red Army is accomplishing what no other army has hitherto succeeded in doing, namely, destroying a powerfully fortified front of a vast extent. This is a strategical, not a tactical, achievement, and by no means an easy one. Nor should it be forgotten that the main forces of the German army, equipped with all modern armament, are still stationed in our theater of hostilities.

As we have already said, the idea of exploiting a break-through in order to turn positional warfare into maneuvering warfare was already contemplated in the last war. But this was only a general idea, which failed to take account of the difficulties involved. For in order to shatter enormous enemy forces stationed along the whole front, an intricate combination of operations of diverse kinds is required, which will lead to the demolition of the enemy's entire front and to the defeat of his army formations both in the front and rear. And it is precisely such a combination of successful operations governed by a single strategical plan that we observe in the Red Army's present offensive.

Let us generally and briefly enumerate these operations. They include break-through and its exploitation in depth by mobile forces simultaneously on a number of sectors; disruption of the enemy's rear communications and encirclement of his forces on the main front line and in the rear; demolition of neighboring sectors of the enemy's defenses by attacks from the front, flank and rear; successive development of operations in depth with the object of surmounting the enemy's rear defense lines and surrounding and destroying his forces.

The simultaneous development of powerful attacks along the front and in depth, drives in various directions, continuous harassing of the enemy's flanks and rear, tense fighting to overcome his fierce resistance —all demand high strategical skill on the part of the Command so as to lend the mobile operations spread over vast areas a systematic and organized character.

It is impossible to recount here even the most important details of the majestic picture of the Red Army's offensive operations in the summer of 1944. But one thing can be said, namely, that in this offensive are combined to perfection the advantages of tank and mechanized troops and aviation, adapted to the peculiarities of a war waged on wide fortified fronts and in powerful defense zones. Bold and impetuous maneuvering by mobile forces is combined with methodical and systematic demolition of the enemy's front and secure consolidation of the successes gained on lines carried far to the west.

Stalin's strategy is based on deep understanding of all features of modern warfare. It embodies—in the immortal victories of the Soviet regiments—the thoroughly digested and scientifically elaborated experience of the two World Wars.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST ORGANIZATION

Resolution adopted by the National Convention of the Communist Political Association held May 20-23, 1944, at New York.

THE twenty-fifth anniversary of the Communist organization arrives at a supreme moment in the war. It occurs at a time when the entire nation girds itself to carry through the invasion of the Nazi-held European continent.

The Communist organization, as an organic part of the American working class, attained its maturity in two and a half decades of great social struggles in which it has actively participated. Throughout this period the special role of the Communists, who believe that eventually the majority of the American people will establish a socialist society as the highest form of democracy, has been that of representing with great vision and bold thought the interests of the American working class and the nation.

The history of the Communist organization is also the history of the American labor movement of the past two and a half decades. It is the glorious heroic story of the American working class, when in a span of a decade it overcame its relative historical backwardness; when from 3,000,000 organized workers in American industries, it attained the giant-like stature of 13,000,000 organized workers. The Communist organization equipped with the science of Marxism, functioning as a vanguard detachment of the working class, has been helping American labor to come into its own, thus also creating the pre-conditions for merging the best interests of the American labor movement with those of the nation as a whole.

The policies of the Communist Party, initiating in the Hoover crisis years the struggle for unemployment insurance, farm relief, veterans' aid, etc., heralded the oncoming of the era of progressive legislation for social insurance, promoting closer cooperation between worker and farmer and other democratic forces.

By virtue of its far-sighted policies, since the early formative years of the Communist movement, the party helped to stir the American labor movement into the great organization drives in the basic indus-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tries. By their yeoman's services and self-sacrificing organizational activities the Communists in the shops, led by Foster, Browder and Johnstone, helped to crash the gates of the company-union towns and to set labor free to organize into the present mighty industrial unions in the basic industries. With political steadfastness and with trade union unity as a goal, the American Marxists have helped the labor movement to turn the erstwhile open-shop forces into citadels of trade unionism. And today the organization of the unorganized has enabled labor to become the backbone of national unity and the spearhead in the battle against fascism.

It is indeed fortunate today, when national unity and the elimination of every vestige of partisanship are the supreme issues for the guarantee of victory, that American labor, by virtue of its present economic and political strength, is in a position to discharge its historic responsibility of helping to unite the nation for victory and peace, for the realization of the objectives of Teheran.

History will record everlasting credit to the American Communist movement and Marxian thought in the United States for their share in contributing to the great patriotic role of American labor in our nation's war for the defeat of fascism, in the strengthening of the international labor and anti-fascist ties of our country.

Through the battles for civil rights, to smash the frame-up system, in the fight to free Tom Mooney, Sacco and Vanzetti, and other victims of reaction, the American Communists have worked to safeguard our democratic liberties and helped to place on our statute books the right to organize and bargain collectively.

Since the very first days of its existence the Communist Party battled for Negro rights. No social-political movement in the United States since the Abolition movement can match the contributions of the Communists in initiating the great modern Negro movement for social equality and the enforcement of the 13th, 14th and 15th Constitutional Amendments.

The battles waged for freedom of the Scottsboro boys, against discrimination and Jim Crow, prepared the way for the inclusion of millions of Negroes into the trade unions. And it is the growing unity between organized labor and the Negro people which has brought the greatest advance toward Negro equality since the Emancipation Proclamation.

The alliance of the Negro people and the labor movement will also pry loose the "white supremacy" stranglehold with which the Southern Bourbons attempt to hold back the advance of democracy in the South and in the nation. Above all, the struggles for Negro equality have helped the Negro people, despite continued injustices and discrimination, to rally behind our Commander-in-Chief in this great war for national liberation. And the gains made in these struggles are the forerunners of still greater victories yet to be achieved in the full integration of the Negro people on

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a basis of complete equality in the democratic life of a free and united America.

The rise of Nazism-fascism has from its inception imperiled the national interests and safety of our Republic. Our national security has rested first of all on the development of a correct foreign policy, expressing the true national interests of the country. The Communists pioneered in awakening the American people to the menace of fascism in the defense of China, Ethiopia and Spain. They championed the struggle against Munichism and for collective security — the main vehicle for the realization of an effective foreign policy to stem the Berlin-Tokyo Axis drive for world conquest.

Basing themselves on the national interests of the country, the Communists have steadfastly promoted the friendship and collaboration of the United States and the great land of socialism, the Soviet Union—that mighty anti-Hitler alliance which has now become the keystone of wartime and post-war unity of the freedom-loving peoples and nations. The Communists have championed the unity of action of world labor and the democratic nations, and have helped the American people to participate in bringing about the triumph of the policy of collective security, which has now emerged in the mighty coalition of the United Nations, of the comradeship-in-arms of the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain.

No "foreign agent" cry could deter the Communists from their struggles for a correct foreign policy and international labor solidarity. In all the vicissitudes of our country's foreign policy of the past years, neither physical nor ideological terror could swerve the Communists from the program of collective security, the path of working-class internationalism, of merciless struggle against fascism.

The Communist Party became an important public factor in the life of the country through years of struggle to overcome its own sectarian weaknesses, cementing its ties with the working people from whom it draws its strength.

It has learned to accept the highest test, demanded by the science of scientific socialism from the vanguard of the working class, that Marxism is a guide to action and not a dogma; that while firmly adhering to the tested scientific principles of Marxism, those principles must be constantly enriched through self-criticism and living, changing reality.

It has performed a service to the labor movement and the nation by waging an uncompromising struggle against the Trotskyites, Lovestoneites, and other fifth column groups and their agents, as well as against reactionary anti-Soviet circles of Social-Democracy.

The history of the Communist Party is the epic of the great transformations in the political life of the nation during the past quarter of a century.

It is the history of how well the Communists learned to meet those changes, not only to recognize them at the moment of their occurrence,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but in time to project needed changes in policy and organization. Thus they have been able to stimulate great mass movements which have helped the working class to realize its creative capacities, to overcome its sectarianism toward other historically progressive social groupings, and to emerge as a great national factor in the life of the nation.

The emergence of the Communist organization as a mature and influential factor in the labor movement and life of the nation is inseparably associated with the leadership of Earl Browder. Under his sterling leadership the Communist organization has learned how to apply Marxist scientific method to living reality, to foresee events and keep pace with them, and, above all, to pursue a correct and steady course. Under his leadership, the party became united and grew strong, able to orient itself, effectively and in time, to unprecedented historical events. Earl Browder has given the Communist organization a profound understanding of American history and democratic traditions, and how to develop the great democratic achievements of Jefferson and Lincoln into living instruments for continued social progress. He has enriched American life with Marxian thought.

On the threshold of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Communist organization, the Communists have resolved to relinquish their status as an electoral party and have organized themselves as the Communist Political Association, continuing their Marxist activities as a working-class political-educational association. They will thus be better able to make their maximum contribution toward welding the anti-fascist unity of the nation to enable America consistently to fulfill its great role in the war and the peace. In doing so, the Communist organization is continuing the Marxist practice of adapting organizational forms to the needs of a changing political situation. It is carrying forward and consolidating nearly a century's efforts to establish a firmly-rooted American working-class organization of Marxists, inspired by our nation's democratic tradition and dedicated to the national interests and democratic aspirations of the American people.

The delegates assembled at this Convention resolve to build the Communist Political Association into a powerful political-educational organization of Communists which will aid the nation and its working class to speed victory over barbaric German and Japanese imperialism, destroy fascism, and strengthen the alliance of the United States, the U.S.S.R., Great Britain, and the other United Nations for a just and stable peace and democratic progress.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT MARXISM CONTRIBUTES TO AMERICA

BY EARL BROWDER

[*On the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Communist organization, we publish here this highly clarifying chapter from Earl Browder's* Teheran, Our Path in War and Peace.—*The Editors.*]

MANY commentators, each with his own ax to grind, have interpreted the policy being developed by American Marxists as the abandonment of Marxism. Those who have been most hostile to Marxism in the past now rush to its defense against the "treason" of the Marxists to their own doctrine. Even the dignified old *New York Times* said it had lost its last shred of confidence in the Communists who had betrayed their own teachings.

This touching concern for the fate of Marxism, on the part of those who formerly, to say the least, sadly neglected it, is very interesting. It deserves an answer from the Communists.

The present policy of American Communists is directed single mindedly to the solution of America's problems in the major crisis of all history. It should be discussed primarily from that point of view. If it contributes seriously to that purpose it is correct, if it fails in that purpose it is incorrect.

Since this book has expounded the merits of our policy in terms of the world situation, and America's position in it, we can afford to give the last word to the question: "What has Marxism to contribute to America?" In the answer to that question is the answer to those who say that Marxism has been abandoned.

Marxism is the application of science to the solution of political problems. It takes up such problems as particular points in the process of history as a whole, which it assumes follows certain principles of development, certain laws of motion, which can be observed and charted and understood. It sets itself the task, on the basis of such an understanding of the principles of history, better to equip mankind to control and guide history-in-the-making today, which for us is made up by America's decisions on our current national problems. If Marxism is truly a science in this sense, it must today first of all correctly answer the problems posed by the war.

A gentleman recently remarked

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to me: "I can understand your policy as one designed solely for winning the war; but I don't understand what, as a result, has become of Marxism." I answered him that I was glad he understood what was necessary to win the war but that I was sorry he misunderstood Marxism as a theory of how to lose the war.

Marxism is today, for America, first of all a guide to victory in the war. Since victory is the supreme necessity for the American people, Marxism will stand or fall by its contribution to victory. If Marxism did not help, if it were even an obstacle to victory, then indeed we could ask: "What has become of Marxism?" But if Marxism proves the greatest help, then it has passed the highest test and it has a great future about which we need not worry.

The program presented in this book for America is a product of Marxist training and thought; it is guided throughout by the principles of Marxism. If that program is sound, it is a victory for Marxism, and is "orthodox" in the sense of being true to basic Marxian principles.

It is true, of course, that this is not an "orthodox" Marxian program in the sense that it reproduces old policies and formulas used by Marxists in the past for different historical situations. No, it is unprecedented and therefore unorthodox. But if we are living in an unprecedented situation, it follows inevitably that a scientifically correct policy for it must be an unprecedented policy. If the policy were orthodox, in the sense of following an established pattern, that would be proof that it was wrong; if it is unprecedented that only means it may be correct.

Whether our policy is correct must be proved by an examination of its merits in relation to the situation as we find it. And the final proof must be found in action, by its successful application in life.

It is the supreme purpose of Marxism to guide the emergence of unprecedented programs of action. Marxism is not a set of dogmas, and all who try to reduce it to that are trying to destroy Marxism. That is why Karl Marx himself once declared in a moment of impatience with some of his disciples: "I am no Marxist." Marxism produces orthodox programs only for "orthodox" situations. But the most decisive moments of history are the unprecedented ones for which an orthodox program spells failure.

Marxism sees history as a process of constant change. That is why real Marxists, not dogmatic ones, are usually the first to recognize and correctly evaluate a new situation.

The greatest contribution Marxism has to make to American thought is to help it escape the fetters of dogmatism. I make that statement in the full consciousness that most American liberals will greet it with ridicule, for our liberals believe it is they who have the free minds and that it is the Communists who have mental fetters. The issue is worth a deeper investigation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In a recent discussion I had with an editor of the liberal newspaper *PM* he complained to me that "Communists in general act as though they had just been in conference with God," and that explained why liberals and others are embarrassed by the Communists and don't like to have them around. I answered that it seemed to us that what the liberals objected to was the idea that any word at all had come from God since the last message they received some generations ago. That, in terms of the American fad of "wisecracks," states the philosophical issue between Marxism and liberalism. The Marxists believe that truth is ascertainable, and when discovered should be energetically spread as widely as possible; the liberals believe that there are from two to a dozen equally valid answers for every question, that the best we can do is obtain a choice among them free from special interest, that drawing lots among the possible answers will furnish as high a degree of success as any other method. The liberal has rejected the single dogma of authoritarianism, only to substitute for it the contradictory dogma of equal authenticity for plural answers. They think their minds are free because they hover about the plurality of answers to the questions of mankind without any guidance; they are free to follow any caprice of the moment. But such freedom is a pure illusion, for only by chance and against great odds can it produce the solution to the practical problems of life. It is the opposite of the scientific method.

The highest contribution Marxism has to make to American life is the introduction of science into politics. It is the substitution of the method of blind trial and error by the method of scientific theory which projects the new and unknown out of the old and known. It is the understanding of the world in motion, and of the laws of motion, which makes possible the anticipation of that which has not yet come into existence, so that the human mind is not confronted with a constant succession of surprises for which it has no preparation.

One of the comic features of public life in America is the strained effort of the newspapers to picture the Communists as always being taken by surprise by every turn and quirk of events, as embarrassed by everything new. This elaborate pretense is used to cover up the surprise and embarrassment of the ones who use it, and not of the Communists, and is maintained only by an equally elaborate falsification of the real position of the Communists. It is practically impossible in America to obtain the slightest idea of what the Communists say about any important question, except in the Communists' own publications. All others, newspapers, magazines, books, lectures, radio, etc., while speaking often and at length about the Communists, always take the greatest pains to hide and distort what the Communists themselves have to say.

A most interesting example of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this was the treatment given my book *Victory—and After* published in 1942. There has been literally not one single attempt made in print to analyze and criticize the thesis of that book. The few pretenses made in that direction (*American Economic Review*, September, 1943; and *Annals of the American Academy*, March, 1944), use the old device of *assuming* that the book, because it was written by a Communist, is nothing but apologetics for the Soviet Union, and then *ignoring* everything except what could be twisted in that direction. Every expression of recognition that the Soviet Union is a major factor in the world is taken as a substantiation that the Communists' "concern for the future of Russia" makes them opposed or blind to the interests of America. The mere stating of the formula is to dispose of our viewpoint with finality.

I can already predict the content of almost all reviews of this present book. Its obvious character, which is a sharp demand for American leadership in the world, and an exposition of how that leadership can be exerted practically, will be entirely hidden under the formula: Browder glorifies Teheran because Stalin was there; he refused to glorify Quebec because Stalin was absent; Q.E.D., Browder is merely a stooge of Stalin, so don't pay any attention to what he says. Such is the degeneracy of American public discussion concerning the viewpoint of the Communists in our own country.

So long as this approach dominates the public attitude to the Communists, there cannot be any sound public opinion about any problem. It is not a question of claiming that the Communists are always right, or even that they are right about any particular thing. The point is that the method of thinking about the Communists is such that it falsifies the whole body of national thought and distorts the whole course of American public life.

Just suppose — dread thought — that the Communists might *happen* to be correct about *one* important point! Even according to the theory that the Communists are usually wrong and to be combated most energetically, it still remains *possible* that they might be correct *once*. But according to the prevailing attitude in America, that would be disastrous for it would mean that thereby the country as a whole is automatically excluded from taking the correct position on that point. Unless this is changed, the only way the Communists could contribute to the welfare of their country would be through the expedient of always carefully taking the wrong position, in the hope that the country would thereby be left free to take the correct position, if by accident someone else might bring it forward! This is a well-developed theory in American intellectual life, known and honored under the name of the "Kiss of Death." Even the most worthy cause becomes anathema, once it has received the "Kiss of Death" of approval and support from the Communists! The journalistic unmentionable, Frederick Woltman, issues public orders to some

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the most powerful men and women in America—and they jump to obey him with an alacrity they would never display to an order from the President of the United States!

The Marxists, by their very existence, make an invaluable contribution to America by revealing the presence of this intellectual poison gas which can destroy America. If the Marxists did not exist, it would be necessary for the nation, in its own interest, to invent them. One Marxist among ten thousand other citizens will infallibly reveal by his presence the degree to which that society is endangered by the cult of irrationality, of obscurantism—the breeding ground of Hitlerism—for it will all stir into virulent recognizable activity at a single Marxist touch. Without the Marxist, the poison gas proceeds to do its deadly work, silently and unrecognized until it is too late.

When Americans have once learned to deal with Marxists, with the Communists, rationally and without hysteria, and consider their views on their merits like those of all other citizens—to be accepted or rejected without regard to their point of origin—this will indeed be a red letter day in the progress of our country and the world.

Under present conditions, it is dangerous even to speak of a "red letter day," for that word "red" will already have done its dirty work and the "day" is one for Martin Dies and his Congressional Committee to investigate!

If anyone should suspect that I am the author of this lampooning grotesquerie, allow me to refer them to the rules of the United States Civil Service Commission on how to locate subversive elements for removal from the public service; there they will find that "an advanced degree of patriotism" is enough to bring one under suspicion. It seems that it is only Marxists who systematically draw all the logical conclusions of a "war for survival," and therefore it becomes dangerous for anyone else to do so. It is the American parallel of the situation in China, where students, suspected of being Communists and therefore in danger of the concentration camp, throw off suspicion by neglecting their work and going to bawdy houses, which at once clears them in the eyes of the Chinese F.B.I. and establishes them as safe and sane respectable citizens.

It is a formidable task which American Marxists have undertaken: to educate their country to an understanding that Communists are human beings much like all their fellow men except that they have found some interesting new methods of thinking.

The task must be accomplished, however difficult it may be, because—above and more immediately than in questions of domestic policy—America will find itself entirely incapable of solving its problems of foreign policy if it is hysterical at the cry of "Communist." The Communists are an inescapable part of the world picture now, and if America is going to play a serious role in this world, we will find it necessary as a nation to deal with

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communists of other lands without growing purple in the face, screaming, kicking the floor, swooning, or displaying other signs of irrational fear. There is no better place to begin to learn this lesson than right here at home with our own domestic species of Communists.

In the course of dealing sanely, objectively, with Communists both at home and abroad, America will gradually and painfully begin to unlearn all its false indoctrination about what is Marxism; we will learn that the picture of wild-eyed, sentimental, extremist, unbalanced, destructive, blood-thirsty, intolerant, dogmatic agitation for revolution-at-all-costs without regard for national interest or patriotism—the picture that has been pounded into their brains by a generation of high-pressured all-persuasive propaganda—is false and the opposite of the truth.

They will find that the Marxists, the Communists, are very calm and sane. Rather than sentimental, they are reasonable. Rather than extremist, they are realistic. Rather than unbalanced, they have learned how to keep their balance amid earthquakes and storms. Rather than destructive, they have learned how to build in the very midst of chaos. Rather than bloodthirsty, their whole philosophy and practice are an expression of the brotherhood of man. Rather than intolerant and dogmatic, they have raised patience to a high art, and flexibility to the level of principle. They never play with the concept of revolution, as some sort of interesting adventure or parlor game; and they always base all considerations of policy squarely on the foundation of the national interest. And with it all the Marxists have a system of thinking which throws a new and deeper light upon the problems of all the peoples of the world, a light which all can share regardless of how they think, if only they will try to think straight.

America's greatest necessity, in this period of world crisis which places every nation to the test, is to learn how to think straight and fast. If we continue to base our political thinking on myths and prejudices, or if we learn the realities of the modern world too slowly to keep pace with history, then nothing can save the America we know from a long period of catastrophe.

If we can face realities without flinching, and revive in modern terms the grand tradition of Jefferson, Paine, and Lincoln, then America can face the world united, assuming a leading and indispensable part in the collective task of the salvation of mankind, as set forth at Teheran.

Teheran showed us our path in war and peace. We must learn how to travel that path, without deviations, to its glorious end.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HERITAGE OF THE COMMUNIST POLITICAL ASSOCIATION *

BY ROBERT MINOR

I.

The Tocsin Is Sounded in the 1860's

THE Communist Party, founded in Chicago a quarter of a century ago, has honorably performed its duty to our nation and our labor movement.

The forces that brought the Communist movement into existence are the deepest, the strongest, the most permanent forces in American history. This land of the most highly developed economic system and correspondingly the most powerful capitalist state — the largest and strongest capitalism the world has ever known — has within it more compelling social causes for a Communist movement than any other country. Our United States is not a baby among nations, not a weakling of history. The very fact that its huge capitalist development has achieved such stature and strength is the guarantee that the United States would have a correspondingly large, powerful and highly developed labor movement. That it would have trade unions in proportion to the magnitude and to the form of the most modern giant industries, and would develop a great mass political movement of the workers, flowing with and shaping, by its size and character, the history of the nation itself.

The founders of the modern labor movement, back in its earliest days, held that "The first great step of importance for every country newly entering into the movement is always the organization of the workers as an independent political party, no matter how, so long as it is a distinct workers' party," * as Engels said in writing to America. Such a workers' party did not come into existence, however, and two generations of philosophers and economists wrote on the question: *"Why is there no Socialism in America?"*

Peculiar features of our country's life retarded the development of such a labor movement. First of these retarding influences was slavery, which in our country persisted centuries after it had ceased to be a system of production in all other advanced countries. As Marx said, "every independent movement of the workers in the United States was paralyzed so long as slavery

* Selection from a report to the national convention of the Communist Political Association, held on May 20-23, 1944, at New York. The report was made on behalf of a Committee for the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the Communist Party. The Communist Party had just been dissolved, making way for the founding of the new, non-party, Communist Political Association.

* Engels, *The Selected Correspondence of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, p. 450.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disfigured a part of the Republic." * But the forces of the modern labor movement were released by the abolition of slavery. "As in the 18th century, the American war of independence sounded the tocsin for the European middle-class, so in the 19th century, the American civil war sounded it for the European working-class." ** Within the year after the surrender of the armies of the slave power a general congress of labor at Baltimore proclaimed the need to liberate the labor of this country from "capitalist slavery." The forces for such a political movement rise from the deepest wells of our nation's history.

When Lincoln signed the Homestead Law on May 20, 1862, and threw open a territory the size of Europe, to be given away free as farms to every comer from any part of the world willing to take 160 acres—a thing which could happen only under the historical conditions then peculiar to America—this became one of the decisive influences from which the founders of our movement traced many of the peculiar features of our history. From such causes arose the traditional "American independence" of workers who could at any time refuse low wages and go west to be farmers.

The United States thereby became the country of the highest wage standards in the world, and from high wages came a development of labor-saving machinery that surpassed that of all other countries. The attraction of higher wages and free land brought about the strange phenomenon which Marx described as the "export of men" from Europe. Many immigrants became farmers on the free land, but more millions became the basic stratum of wage workers in the great American heavy industries, the giant forges of the tools of civilization, with which our country outdistanced all others in the world.

All of the heavy industries that are the foundation of American industrial life were manned by foreign-born workers. More than 60 per cent of the steel workers, for instance, were foreign born in 1918, about half were non-citizens and a very large proportion were completely unable to speak English. This is not a "foreign" substance in the body of America, but one of its organic parts—profoundly necessary and distinctive of the nation. The fact that the labor force of all of heavy industry, largely unskilled, was under special handicaps against organization, such as a lack of the common language, and was more easily deprived of political rights, made for the separation of the highly skilled workers from the great mass in basic industries. The American industries had employers who knew "how to play off one nationality against the other." * Chauvinism was more easily cultivated among native American workers, and trade unionism more easily narrowed down to the skilled crafts. The independent working-class political movement tended to become a monopoly of the foreign-born workers, and to be isolated and sectarian. The beginnings of a Social-

* Marx, *Capital*, Kerr edition, Vol. I, p. 329.
** *Ibid.*, p. 14.

* Engels, *The Selected Correspondence of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, p. 497.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ist Party did not find root among the native-born American workers, but among the immigrants, and these brought with them mainly the doctrines most familiar to the workers of Germany at the time—the sectarian "Socialism" of Ferdinand Lassalle, quite distinct from the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels. The membership of the Socialist Labor Party of the United States, founded in 1874, was 90 per cent foreign-born, and its first program carried the sectarian slogans of the German immigrant followers of Lassalle. Isolated from the trade union movement in fact, it made a "political principle" of this isolation.

The Civil War had been fought under the leadership of a bourgeois political party of great democratic militancy. But this Republican Party, within ten years after the Civil War, ceased to be a defender of democracy. Northern capitalists, dominant in the Republican Party, came to the view that the position of inferiority imposed upon the Negro by the Southern reaction after the abolition of slavery tended to check any general rise in wages, and, they thought, contributed to industrial profits by holding down the living standards of labor generally. This added to the influences retarding the general social and cultural advance of the national life and tended to eradicate from the two great political parties their substantial differences.

The Two-Party System

Many attempts at the formation of an independent general political movement of labor failed and the United States settled down, as Engels said, to "providing the European world with the proof that a bourgeois republic is a republic of capitalist business men in which politics are only a business deal, like any other." * The "business of politics" took the form of the "two-party system," of which the classic picture was given by Engels in 1891:

"Nowhere do 'politicians' form a more separate, powerful section of the nation than in North America. There, each of the two great parties which alternately succeed each other in power is itself in turn controlled by people who make a business of politics, who speculate on seats in the legislative assemblies of the Union as well as of the separate states, or who make a living by carrying on agitation for their party and on its victory are rewarded with positions. It is well known that the Americans have been striving for thirty years to shake off this yoke, which has become intolerable, and that in spite of all they can do they continue to sink ever deeper in this swamp of corruption. It is precisely in America that we see best how there takes place this process of the state power making itself independent in relation to society, whose mere instrument it was originally intended to be. Here there exists no dynasty, no nobility, no standing army, beyond the few men keeping watch on the Indians, no bureaucracy with permanent posts or the right to pensions. And nevertheless we find here two great gangs of political speculators, who alternately take possession of the state power and exploit it by the most corrupt means and for the most cor-

* Engels, *ibid.*, p. 502.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rupt ends— and the nation is powerless against these two great cartels of politicians, who are ostensibly its servants, but in reality exploit and plunder it." *

Founding of the Socialist Party

The Socialist Party was nevertheless founded in 1901 under the pressure of the rise of the great monopolies and the policy of "expansion" that began with the Spanish-American War in 1898 and inaugurated for our country the epoch of imperialism. Largely because of its abandoning many of the sectarian ideas of the Socialist Labor Party, and especially those in regard to trade unions, the Socialist Party was the durable beginning on which the real party of Marxism was to be founded.

It was in the Socialist Party that most of the early leaders of the future Communist Party found their first political consciousness. I believe the oldest of those was a certain housewife who in 1897 joined the "Social Democracy of America" organized by Eugene V. Debs and later merged in the Socialist Party. That housewife who joined the Socialist Party nearly half a century ago under the magnetic persuasion of Debs is sitting on this platform today, one of the foremost of our leaders—Ella Reeve Bloor. In 1901 a young chemical worker, William Z. Foster, joined the Socialist Party. In 1907 the great mass movement in defense of William D. Haywood, leader of the Western Federation of Miners, who was framed up on a false murder charge in the trade union struggles of the West, brought many thousands of workers into the Socialist Party. Among these recruits was a sixteen-year-old Kansas boy, Earl Browder. At just the same time, in 1907, and under the influence of the same mass stimulus of the Haywood case, at the age of 23, I joined the Socialist Party. In 1909 there appeared in the workers' political movement the man who was to become the founder of the Communist Party, a son of a Cleveland longshoreman. It was C. E. Ruthenberg.

The Socialist Party grew. In 1912 the *Appeal to Reason,* the famous weekly paper which was the first teacher of the older generation of present-day Communists—my teacher from the time I was 22 years of age—had reached a circulation of 985,000. Lenin said something about it that we ought to recall when we consider the present great newspaper of our movement. Lenin said:

"When in Germany the number of members of the Socialist Party had reached 970,000, when in America the weekly Socialist paper reaches 985,000 circulation, everyone who has eyes to see must recognize that the proletarian as an individual is powerless, the proletarian millions are omnipotent." *

Those were times of great strife in America, the dawn of the epoch of imperialism. William J. Bryan called for measures to head off the development of a great mass workers' Socialist movement and declared that its growing influence was due to the fact that the Democratic Party had been "too conserva-

* Engels, in Marx, *Selected Works,* Vol. II, pp. 458-59.

* *Ibid.,* Vol. XVI, p. 148.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive." Woodrow Wilson said "we are at the threshold of revolution," and Theodore Roosevelt formed the Bull Moose Party, appropriating — as Lenin pointed out — everything he could copy from the program of the Socialist Party that did not literally call for the abolition of capitalism.

It appeared likely there would be both a break-up of the two-party system, which then had such a deadening influence on American national life, and a belated beginning of the independent political movement of labor. But the Socialist Party did not become a mass party, and no general labor party took permanent form. A partial reason for this is often found in the fact that the Left wing was drawn constantly into syndicalism. A magnificent struggle led by the Industrial Workers of the World made it the pioneer (within its time) in organizing industrial unions in the mass-production factories and among agricultural workers. A harmful byproduct was that syndicalism became in the minds of most advanced workers a symbol representing the revolutionary development in the labor movement—its petty-bourgeois radicalism passed for revolutionary theory. Foster, who had become one of the leaders of the I.W.W., founded a Syndicalist League, intended to correct some features of the I.W.W. policy. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn became a flaming leader of some of the most glorious battles of the I.W.W. The momentary successes and inspiring heroism of the workers in that movement could not overcome, but rather helped to obscure, the fatal lack of Marxist guidance of the workers' movement. Yet we cannot dismiss the magnificent role of the I.W.W. and its best leaders on the mere ground that its theories did not meet the test of Marxist science as made clearer to us in more enlightened days. As Lenin himself pointed out:

". . . Both anarcho-syndicalism and reformism — which seize upon *one* aspect of the labour movement, which elevate one-sidedness to a theory, and which declare such tendencies or features of this movement as constitute a specific peculiarity of a given period, of given conditions of working class activity, to be mutually exclusive—must be regarded as a direct product of this bourgeois world conception and its influence. But real life, real history, *includes* these different tendencies, just as life and development in nature include both slow evolution and rapid leaps, breaks in continuity." *

We claim for our developed Marxist organization the best traditions of both of these movements of the workers.

World War—1914-1918

The World War of 1914-1918—the reactionary character of that war—found expression inevitably in savage reprisals against the labor movement. "Labor support of the war" was the name of a grim tragedy in which trade union leaders and a small fringe of highly skilled crafts participated with some narrow advantage, while all efforts at organization of the masses of labor were met with blood and iron at the hands of state and federal governments. Behind the scenes the struggles of labor and capital were rag-

* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. XI, p. 740.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing. The momentous frame-up of the A. F. of L. trade union organizer Tom Mooney, in San Francisco, who was sentenced to death on the gallows, ostensibly for murder but really for an attempt to organize among the mass of unskilled workers, resulted in the greatest defense movement that ever swept the American Federation of Labor—a portent of the future. It became one of the stimuli not only for a movement for rejuvenating the trade unions, but also for the formation of a Left wing of the Socialist movement. (It is characteristic that many of the outstanding supporters of the defense of Mooney later became leaders of the Communist Party.) Wholesale prosecutions and incredibly savage sentences immured practically the whole leadership of the I.W.W. Thus the most extreme of the acts of repression were directed toward preventing the spread of trade union organization beyond the narrow confines of the skilled crafts. But even the craft unions were savagely attacked by the "open shop" movement.

The Socialist Party became a seething mass of protest against the war despite efforts of most of its leaders to prevent it. When the United States became a belligerent in 1917 an emergency conference at St. Louis adopted a resolution condemning the war as imperialist. Nearly all of the consistent supporters of this resolution were later to be founders of the Communist Party. The majority of the Socialist Party membership had rapidly developed a more revolutionary outlook, while the leadership became, in the main, more opportunistic, chauvinistic.

The Russian Revolution —November, 1917

The biggest event of centuries was the Russian Revolution. All organizations of the world claiming the character of workers' institutions were faced with the necessity of meeting the question—*for* or *against* the international solidarity in support of that revolution. The Socialist Party had to pass through the great political "clearing house."

In the days long ago when we old-timers first joined the Socialist movement, we used to take it for granted that whenever Socialism came into existence or when any heroic attempt to bring it about occurred anywhere in the world, all of us would support it with heart and soul—all of the labor movement would be for it surely. But of course we were mistaken in this. For in the Socialist movement throughout the world a powerful current of opportunism had grown up representing the influence of capitalist imperialism upon the working class. It drew its strength from the fact that superficially it served the narrowest immediate interests of the "aristocracy" of labor, the highly skilled, and above all the short-sighted interests of a generally narrow-minded bureaucracy. The Second International, thoroughly rotten with the worldwide opportunist corruption that had developed, collapsed when its leaders openly passed over to imperialism in 1914.

The 1917 Revolution in Russia acted as a great catalyst. The inevitable call for the establishment of a Third International crystallized the issue: *for* or *against* the new International.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II.

The Founding of the Communist Party, 1919

The Communist Party was founded in September, 1919, by the majority of the members of the Socialist Party.

The Socialist Party showed itself overwhelmingly in favor of joining the Communist International. Eugene V. Debs, its foremost popular leader, pronounced himself "from the crown of my head to the soles of my feet a Bolshevik"—and Debs was quickly sent to prison for having opposed the war, as were many other Socialist leaders. Morris Hillquit and his group in control of the Socialist Party were coldly opposed to the mass desire, but sought to retain control of the organization. They declared themselves in favor of joining the Communist International, but with a few "reservations" which they said could be "easily explained" if only the comrades abroad would hold in abeyance the question of support of the revolution until peace came. The majority of the Socialist Party—the Left wing—was led by the young Ohio leader Ruthenberg. Many who shared the leadership with Ruthenberg are here today—Earl Browder, who was a very young man then, Ella Reeve Bloor and Alfred Wagenknecht.

All of the younger members of our movement should be reminded that in 1919 the Socialist Party, by a great majority, voted to join the Communist International. But the National Executive Committee under Hillquit sat continuously during the referendum, and as fast as news of the vote came, the party organizations that voted in favor of the party's joining the Communist International were expelled from the party. Their votes were not counted. On the day the voting began the Socialist Party had 104,000 members. While the votes were being counted, 78,000 of these were expelled, and at the end of the vote the Socialist Party had 26,000 members left. The Communist Party was founded by the majority of the members of the Socialist Party expelled for voting "yes" in the referendum on whether the Socialist Party should join the Communist International.

Earl Browder was in prison at the time of the convention that founded the Communist Party, but sent word that he would adhere to the Communist Party. Debs did not.

Struggles of American Workers at the Root of It

It would be a false picture, belying the nature of such political events, if we were to describe the formation of the Communist Party simply as something that happened within the walls of a convention hall. Mass resentment of the imperialist character of the war of 1914-1918 and of the callous plundering of the workers during the war, together with disillusionment in the character of the treaties in which its results were recorded, became manifest in a worldwide ferment of labor, from which the United States was not immune. During the very days when the party was being formed, the great industries were

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being shaken by convulsions of post-war discontent.

The mass of workers in the steel, coal, railroad and other basic industries raised their voices. For the first time in many years the steel workers, of whom 367,000 were organized by a committee of the A. F. of L. whose secretary-treasurer and leader was William Z. Foster, carried on a heroic struggle which lasted three and a quarter months. The terrorism of the coal and iron police was used to break the movement. It was a defeated strike, but it was one of that kind of defeats in which the battle had to be fought—defeat or no defeat—and the valiant conduct of the fight would guarantee at least a future victory.

The lessons of the steel strike and of railroad, coal and other portentous struggles at the time were brought home with a clear theoretical and practical explanation through the Trade Union Educational League headed by Foster and Browder. Tens of thousands in the steel towns and the coal fields, on the railroads and on the ships at sea, became convinced that the battle for organization would be fought again in a better way, in the light of the lessons of modern trade unionism, of the necessity of the industrial form of organization in such fields, and that then the battle would be won.

All of the predictions have come true. When we look over America's scene of industry today and see the powerfully effective unions, we recall those early days.

Foster's revolutionary steadfastness, his intelligence, his loyalty to his people, led him inevitably to the Communist Party. With him came a number of the foremost young leaders of the trade unions of the time. I always felt that these facts were a sort of a pledge of history that our Marxist political movement would eventually, without the slightest doubt, achieve political influence among those great masses.

A word about Foster. Many people like to speak of him as a paragon of "pure practice," separate and apart from theory. But that is not and could not be true. Foster has fulfilled great practical tasks, it is true, but the real quality of leadership that he brought to our party was precisely the combination of practical knowledge with the most advanced generalizations of the experience of the labor movement over the whole world, especially as those generalizations are made by Lenin. This will be completely understood if we see, as Lenin pointed out, that the industrial form of unions is an absolutely inevitable product of modern giant industry, and not a matter of someone's happy "invention" or personal taste. Foster showed that the solution of the problem of trade unionism in America, and particularly in the mass production industries, was to be found, not in the invention of a "Father Hagerty's wheel of fortune," as he used to say—not by scrapping the existing unions in favor of schematic diagrams of what ideal unions ought to be—but by participation in the work and struggles of the existing unions, clarifying through day-to-day practice, as well as by teaching theoretically, the scientific principles which are far removed from syndicalism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Leadership: Ruthenberg to Browder

Inevitably the weaknesses of the past in the labor movement and in the old Socialist Party came forth to plague the new Communist Party with sectarianism and factionalism. Factionalism of an unprincipled character, arising from such sources, interfered with all our relationships within the party and between the party and the trade unions. Ruthenberg, with his great political capacity and his prestige as the founder of the party, was the party's leader beyond question. But all the strength of his great personality was required to hold together the warring factions into which the party remained divided up to and after his death. It is to me quite significant that Earl Browder, then still in his twenties, played the role of a connecting link, across the factional gap between the party headquarters in New York, headed by Ruthenberg, and the Chicago office where Foster was at the head of the trade union work. In the faction-split convention of the Communist Party in 1922 I made a motion, supported by Ruthenberg, that the two factions should agree to elect Foster unanimously to the National Committee before taking the vote on the faction slates; and later, in the Political Committee, I made the other motion by which Browder was assigned to cover the breach between the two.

Many difficulties—such as the arrest of practically the entire leadership of the Communist Party in 1922 and its prosecution as an "illegal" organization—were overcome at the very moment when we were taking our first steps in a great campaign for the formation of a labor party based on the trade unions. Already the party's prestige and its appeal to the instinct of solidarity of the workers were sufficient to overcome the legal attack. The very prosecutions themselves were converted into the occasion for the establishment of the party as the fully legal "Workers (Communist) Party." In 1924 the enormous advance step was made of the founding of the *Daily Worker*. This alone was a chapter-mark in the history of the American people. The *Daily Worker* is in this perspective the most important newspaper in the western world. But the party grew very slowly.

In the later 1920's the worldwide movements of the corrupt elements known as Trotskyites and the Bukharinites, supporting conspiracies within the Soviet Union, and connected with its foreign enemies, aiming at the overthrow of the socialist state, began to show a virulent activity in our own country. In those years of Coolidge and Dawes and Hoover there was a certain recovery in capitalist countries from the economic devastation of the World War, and, as someone said, it seemed as though the power of capital was omnipotent, that any hope of success of socialism and the labor movement was an illusion; it was a time when "all the world bowed low before the dollar," and faith in anything else was put to the severest test. In 1928 Trotsky's adherents in America were exposed in a conspiracy against the Communist Party and were expelled; and the development of the group of "Right" opportunists, headed by Lovestone—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not essentially different from the Trotskyites, but more immediately related to the opportunist trend of Bukharin—became evident shortly afterward.

The death of Ruthenberg in March, 1927, was the heaviest blow to the party. Ruthenberg had been the very symbol of the life and unity and ideals of the party. His death left us in the worst possible situation, due to the long-standing factional division. This factional division made it impossible to prevent the rise of the adventurer Lovestone to virtual control of the party for a period of many months which ended, as all such struggles invariably ended, with the expulsion of this second group of opportunist adventurers in 1929.

The Leadership of Earl Browder

The history of our movement shows that every crisis in the national situation, every turn in history resulted for us in a test and strengthening of leadership. Ruthenberg stood the test as the founder of our Communist Party. Two and a half years after his death we came to the great turn, the economic crisis of 1929. A tremendous reorientation had to be made, new leadership brought forward, mass struggles led.

A "tribune of the people" had to be found. He was found, and has measured up to the highest test. His name is Browder.

Lenin said: "Not a single class in history has achieved power without producing its political leaders, its political representatives able to organize a movement and lead it." Such a man is Earl Browder. If you ask me to define in a couple of words the main characteristic of Browder, I would say it is political courage. This explains the great stature of Browder and is inseparable from his great clarity of mind in theory and practice. Political courage includes but is something more and bigger than just the courage of an isolated individual. It is a kind of courage that seeks out and finds a similar courage in the people. There are lots of leaders who have personal courage standing as individuals above the masses. The peculiarity about the old Jacobins of the French Revolution was that they not only had personal courage but also knew how an equal courage could be found deep down among the people. The Communists are the modern Jacobins. Their courage proves in the end to be the courage of the people, incorporated in such a man as Browder.

With the coming of the leadership of Browder and the serious engagement in mass struggles the Communist Party achieved real unity for the first time. It was only through discarding the rotting sectarian elements, the non-Communist adventurers, and bringing forward of strong, Marxist leadership and the corresponding sound policy, that the party was able to perform its duty in the great struggles of 1929 and the '30's for social insurance, for organization and support of the many tremendously effective demonstrations of the unemployed movement, for the veterans' bonus march, etc. A milepost marking a new period of national policy was passed when the first unemployment relief measures were adopted as a result of the people's struggles.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A LESSON IN DEMOCRACY

ON THE OCCASION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

BY A. LANDY

ON SEPTEMBER 1, the American Communist movement will celebrate its twenty-fifth anniversary. There was a time when this might have been of interest to only a small part of the American people. But ever since Hitler tried to camouflage his drive for world conquest with the "bogey of communism" an intelligent understanding of the character of the Communist movement became a historical and practical necessity for the entire nation. For Hitler who, like Dante's wild beast, was more hungry after each meal, used the "menace of communism" as his chief political weapon for dividing his prospective victims, nation from nation, and each nation within itself. To deprive him of this weapon and to strengthen national unity against predatory fascism, it was essential to understand the real character of the Communist movement, which did not mean imposing on the country the study and discussion of communism or compelling agreement with its principles; but it did mean making a serious effort to acquire objective knowledge about the Communists. For, after all, the only refuge from the deleterious effects of a bogey, as Earl Browder has repeatedly pointed out, is to get acquainted with the real thing.

And yet, Hitler's use of this "Communist bogey" is only a negative, though plainly urgent, reason for being better informed about the true character of the Communist movement. The positive reasons go much deeper and, if grasped, provide a better preparation for meeting the realities of the present world.

1. The American Communist movement is a historically established and socially vital force, representing the views and ideals of a democratic political current actually over one hundred years old; its influence is too deeply rooted in the social aspirations and struggles of the American working class and the vital needs of the nation to be dismissed as of no consequence.

2. The Communists have been making a signal contribution to the country's war of survival, precisely because of the strength of their influence in the labor movement; the nation cannot ignore this contribu-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion and its significance without weakening all the driving forces of its democratic development.

3. The Communists will be an important factor in the post-war relations of our country to the rest of the world.

A Strange Proposal

If a correct attitude toward the Communist movement is necessary for national unity to assure victory in the war, it is equally necessary for national unity in the interest of an orderly democratic advance after the war. The urgency of this is apparent from the fact that there are persons in the United States who want to win the war and assure a durable peace — and yet predicate this peace on the abolition of the Communist movement all over the world. Nothing need be said of the morality of such people, who are willing to secure victory in cooperation with the Communists everywhere, but who would like to destroy them as soon as the job is done.

But this is exactly what such a competent journalist and supporter of the war as Walter Lippmann proposes in his latest book, *U. S. War Aims.* Stated briefly, Lippmann's thesis declares:

That the Soviet Union is a totalitarian dictatorship;

That the United States can remain at peace with the Soviet Union only if the latter adopts "democracy," that is, the American way of life, and agrees to the suppression of the Communist movements in Europe and America.

What is startling about this thesis is that a man of Lippmann's caliber and background can project a perspective of war between the United States and the Soviet Union at a time when these two countries, together with Britain, are putting into practice an agreement which provides for a post-war era of enduring peace and while the common war against Hitler is still in progress. It betrays a desire to restrict the influence and role of the Soviet Union in the post-war period, a position at complete variance with the premises embodied in the Teheran Agreement, and perspectives of full and equal cooperation. How Lippmann could arrive at this thesis as his main conclusion from all that has happened in the world in the past eleven years, and especially from the Anglo-Soviet-American collaboration on the field of battle, is not for us to explain. And yet the fact remains that Lippmann, an able thinker, starting from the correct premise that the fear of communism must be eliminated for the sake of world peace, arrives at the false and dangerous conclusion that this requires the elimination of the Communists on pain of war against the Soviet Union. It is an indication of the terrible consequences which can follow from ignorance regarding the character of the Communist movement.

We can, of course, dismiss Lippmann's *fiat* declarations about the character of the Soviet Union as utterly worthless and arrogant, reminiscent of the idiocies perpetrated against that country during the disgraceful "Communazi" days of August-September, 1930. At this late

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stage, suddenly to insist on judging Soviet democracy by the standards of American capitalist democracy is not only irresponsible national arrogance, but highly suspicious behavior. To question the democratic character of the land of socialism after the matchless performance and countless sacrifices of its entire people against Hitlerism in the service of all humanity is unworthy of an honest man. Judged by the test of performance in the war, both in its military and diplomatic phases —and, in the last analysis, there is no more effective or more practical test today—the Soviet Union is outstanding as a *democratic* power.

Lippmann talks glibly about dissolving the Communist movements of Europe and America—as if all that were involved were the closing of a bank account. For some strange reason, he selects little Switzerland as the model to follow in such an action. But the world remembers the more notorious example of Hitler Germany where the suppression of the Communist movement was only the preliminary to the destruction of the whole labor movement and the institution of a regime of bloody terror, followed by a drive for world conquest. If Lippmann's thesis has a familiar ring to it, it is because the world has had ample opportunity to become acquainted with it in the form originally advanced by barbarous German imperialism.

The Communist Parties are not only playing a magnificent role in the destruction of fascism and winning the war; but, as a result of this, they are being welcomed into the new democratic governments arising in Europe. In asking for the destruction of the Communist Parties, Lippmann, therefore, is asking for a reversal of the existing relations in the anti-Hitler camp of Europe and the world. But to ask for this is to ask for civil war in Europe and for scrapping the Teheran Agreement and its perspectives of order and peace. That is the real substance of Lippmann's thesis.

A Lesson from France

How far removed Lippmann's speculations are from the real trend of developments produced by the war is shown by what is taking place in the flesh-and-blood struggle in Europe. In the countries of Europe, devastated and tortured by the Nazi conquerors, the prejudices and divisions sedulously cultivated against the Communists during the past quarter century have been swept away by the torrents of blood which the patriots of all classes have poured out in resistance to the common enemy. A profound change has occurred in these countries in the relation of the nation to the Communists; and this change, so incalculable in its significance for the future, is a much more accurate indication of what is happening in the world than the illusions and misrepresentations which generally pass for facts in the American press.

Some idea of this change can be gotten from a stirring little volume on the French underground by Joseph Kessel, just translated into English under the title of *Army of Shadows*. "I should like you to understand me once and for all," a non-Communist engineer declares to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a fellow prisoner in a French concentration camp. "There are no longer suspicions, hatreds or barriers of any sort between communists and others. Today we are French. We are all in the same fight. And it is the communists against whom the enemy is most rabid. We know it. And we know that they are as brave as the bravest and better organized. They help us and we help them. They like us and we like them. Everything has become very simple. . . . I don't know a man in the resistance who does not speak of the communists with a special quality in his voice and expression, a deeper gravity."

In the United States everything has not become so simple and crystal clear yet; the United States has not suffered from the horrors of Nazi occupation. But the great lessons of the war are being reflected even in our more limited experience, and the profound changes which are transforming all relations in Europe and the Far East and etching the pattern of the future are slowly but surely being registered here too.

We do not know for whom Lippmann speaks besides himself or what forces other than the most reactionary he expects will sponsor and promote such a policy. But it is evident that he is not speaking in the spirit of the Teheran agreement, which embodies the will and the best interests of world democracy. Surely he must know that peace for generations can be achieved only by the victory of the democratic forces who will insist on policies assuring a democratic course of development of the world.

False Premises

From the American viewpoint, there are two false assumptions underlying Lippmann's thesis: (1) that American citizens do not have the right to hold Communist views or belong to a Communist organization, and, by so doing, place themselves beyond our democratic Constitution; (2) that the Communist movement is incompatible with democracy.

These assumptions have been effectively disposed of, both legally and theoretically, even by the United States Supreme Court in its decision on the Schneiderman case in June, 1943. This decision recognized that American citizens holding Communist views or membership in the Communist organization are acting within the framework of the Constitution. It based this on the principle that the Constitution is no straitjacket on progress and on future generations and that social, economic and political changes produce changing needs. It refused to restrict the concept of freedom of thought, either to a majority or to a minority, or in the range or in the extremity of the thought, and consequently to the exclusion of fundamental revolutionary change. It refused to regard Communist proposals for ultimate social change as incompatible with the political philosophy of the Constitution and the democratic tradition. It acknowledged that the Communist movement represents a democratic political current in American life—a fact underscored by the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

signal contribution of the Communists to our nation's war effort.

The assumption that the Communists are not and cannot be an integral part of the democratic development of the nation is also contrary to the democratic origin, ideals and practical achievements of the Communist movement. The modern Communist movement had its origin in England, France and the United States. It arose within the great bourgeois-democratic revolutions of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, expressing the desire of the most consistent democrats in these revolutions for the energetic defense and development of the newly established republics against monarchic counter-revolution and for the extension of the benefits of these republics to the common people. "The first appearance of a really active Communist party," Karl Marx declared, "may be placed within the period of the middle-class revolution, the moment when constitutional monarchy was abolished." The Communist movement was the organized expression of the desire of labor and the common people to liberate themselves from exploitation and oppression and to achieve equality and abundance for all.

Marxism, the defining characteristic of present-day communism, also arose within the modern democratic movement for the abolition of feudal conditions in Germany. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, the men who placed communism on a scientific basis, were active members of the German democratic camp which carried on republican and democratic agitation in monarchic Prussia. They were part of the university group of Young Hegelians which supplied the personnel of the German democratic press in 1840-1842. Confronted by the social question, and inspired by French communism and English Chartism, the contemporary form of the labor movement of these countries, they began to study the working of modern capitalist society.

They came to the conclusion that political democracy alone was insufficient and that the industrial proletariat of the cities, with its demand for social equality, had become the core of all modern democracy, the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry depending entirely on its initiative. "When the proletarian parties of various nations unite," Engels wrote in 1845, "they are quite right in inscribing the word 'democracy' on their banners."

The new Communist party, organized by Marx and Engels at this time, was outspoken about its democratic aspirations. In 1847, for example, the *Communist Journal* took Karl Heinzen, a bourgeois radical, to task for distorting the Communist position on democracy. "Either Karl Heinzen is completely ignorant of the meaning of communism," it declared, "or he has allowed his personal antagonism to certain Communists to prejudice his judgment of the party which stands in the front ranks of the armies fighting for democracy." The official *Manifesto of the Communist Party,* written by Marx and Engels in 1848, called for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

winning the battle of democracy which would require the attainment of political power by the working class.

Marx and Engels fully appreciated the significance of the existence of democracy in the United States. In 1845, when they began the struggle to place the Communist movement on a scientific basis, they took issue with such German Communists as Herman Kriege, who had come to the United States that year and tried to set up a secret society along the old pattern prevailing in the Communist movement before Marx and Engels came forward. They insisted that the task of German immigrants in the United States was to become fully American and that, as Communists, they must immediately associate themselves with the real American labor movement which, at that time, assumed the form of a struggle for free land and was known as the Agrarian or National Reformers. In 1847 they reiterated their stand that, since the United States has a democratic Constitution, the Communists must make common cause with those who are utilizing this Constitution in the interests of the working class and the people in the struggle against the bourgeoisie. They contrasted the conditions in Europe and the United States, and expressed the opinion that because of the existence of democracy in America, which gave political rights to labor, the social transformation of society in the New World might take place by peaceful means as part of the democratic process.

The Test of War

It is no accident, therefore, that in two of the great wars which have been fought to determine the fate of our country as a free and independent nation, the Civil War of 1861 and the present war, the Communists have demonstrated their democratic devotion to the nation and the people in self-sacrificing deeds. In the Civil War of 1861 the leading Marxists volunteered in the Union armies and because of their valor and initiative received officers' commissions from President Lincoln. Joseph Weydemeyer, friend and follower of Karl Marx, even became a general in charge of the St. Louis district. Karl Marx himself, residing in London, rallied the workers of England and Europe in support of the United States government, for which Lincoln expressed the gratitude of the American people. In the present war against fascism the contributions of the Communists are a matter of public record. Humanity has never asked any more positive proof than this. But to the advocate of the abolition of the Communist movement this apparently does not constitute proof. He wants the Communists to prove themselves not by what they do in the course of their existence, but by going out of existence altogether! Obviously this is not a demand for proof; it is proof of an utterly irrational demand.

The history of the Communist movement, especially during the past eleven years, has been interwoven with issues and developments of the greatest magnitude in the life of our nation. An unpreju-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

diced evaluation would show that the Communist movement has played a positive and influential role in determining their outcome. But Lippmann prefers to imply that all the Communists have contributed during this time is an issue. As a convenient and facile way to dispense with the need of thinking about complicated questions, this may be sufficient. But as an understanding of the main forces of our country's democratic development, it is worse than shallow.

The facts speak for themselves:

1. The Communists taught millions of Americans how to organize and fight for unemployment relief and social security.

2. The Communists pioneered in the organization of the unorganized millions of America's workers; in the building of mighty industrial unions and a labor movement, now fourteen million strong, which constitutes the main bulwark of American democracy; and, above all, in helping to crystallize the independent economic and political strength of American labor for the first time in the history of the United States.

3. The Communists played a leading and decisive role in helping the Negro people win the support of the labor movement in their struggle for equality, and in enabling them to emerge as a powerful factor for democracy in our nation.

4. The Communists pioneered in opening the South to the modern labor and democratic movements which is leading to a fundamental change in the role of that great section of the country in the life and history of the nation.

5. The Communists, by their influence in the labor movement, among the Negro people and the progressive forces generally, have made a decisive contribution toward enabling our country to meet the greatest crisis in its history, its third and biggest war for national independence and freedom.

What else are these but signal contributions to the welfare of the nation and the creation of the main driving forces of our democratic existence and development?

But the truth is that Lippmann is concerned neither with the theory nor the practice of democracy. To the extent that it finds expression in his thesis, it is in the form of the notorious "fear of democracy" which we have met time and again in the history of modern society ever since the rise of capitalism in the sixteenth century. All one can say of this is what Turgot, the great French publicist and contemporary of our Founding Fathers, said of some of their fears of democracy: "By striving to escape imaginary dangers they had created real ones." The only difference is that Lippmann's views are not those of the responsible forces guiding the destiny of our nation. Nor is the issue which he projects for the post-war period the issue which will arise out of victory in the war. For, this issue and victory over Hitler are two mutually exclusive concepts, two mutually exclusive facts.

Lippmann regards himself as a ruthless realist; he thinks only in the hard terms and brutal realities of power—obviously the power of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imperialism. But because his eye is focused on the wrong power, he sees the wrong "realities." The actual realities are moving along a different path, a democratic path of development, as the whole course of the war is demonstrating; and it is this democratic path which will assert itself as the inexorable logic of victory in the war. And the surest guarantee of this is the *power* of the democratic forces which have been brought forward by the war and which is exercised through the alliance of the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain.

This is the reason Lippmann's thesis also fails the moral test. The contradiction between morality and the "brutal realities" of power in Lippmann's position, which leads him to dismiss moral considerations altogether, arises from the fact that he operates with the wrong "realities," the "realities" of imperialist power politics. By clinging to the premise of imperialist power relations which are devoid of any moral content, his only refuge is to dismiss moral considerations altogether, not as a more adequate substitute but rather as a cover for the total abandonment of such considerations, which, in the last analysis, are essentially considerations of justice. Were Lippmann to base himself on the "realities" and the power of the democratic driving forces emerging out of the war, the contradiction inherent in his thesis would disappear; the considerations of morality and reality would merge; for the policies and interests of the democratic forces, in contrast to imperialist interests, are profoundly moral, for they are profoundly just and in full harmony with the progressive interests of all nations and peoples.

The trouble with Lippmann is that he operates with abstract categories and overlooks the real forces of democracy, the forces of the people whose needs are inseparably associated with the over-riding necessities of economy and national interest. Order, peace, democracy, national interest—all the things in the name of which Lippmann advances his thesis, can be realized only by the assertion of these forces. These are the realities; and here lies the power; not where Lippmann sees them. The science of thought has never consisted in presenting passing facts as eternal verities. And there is no room in the new world arising out of the war for Hitler's scale of values regarding the Communist movement.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A RESOLUTE NON-PARTISAN POLICY TO STRENGTHEN NATIONAL UNITY *

BY EUGENE DENNIS

ONE of the central conclusions which must be drawn from the latest political and election developments, including the outcome of the Republican and Democratic conventions, is the need of strengthening labor and national unity. Now more than ever before, as Earl Browder has stressed, it is necessary to *steer a resolute course of non-partisanship in the elections, to work to unite patriots of all classes and party affiliations for the re-election of Roosevelt and the election of a victory Congress.* For only in this way can victory be assured in November for the coalition supporting the Commander-in-Chief and the government's war and post-war policies.

In terms of practical election considerations it is clear that only a non-partisan election policy can succeed in influencing and rallying the bulk of the independent voters who comprise over 25 per cent of the electorate—and a most decisive part. Only such a policy can influence the majority of the Negro people to support the re-election of the President. Only such a policy can influence and draw into progressive political action the millions of new workers who have entered into war industry. And only such an approach can influence tens of thousands of the adherents of Willkie to rise above partisan considerations.

No less important than such considerations as these is the cardinal fact that the most vital interests of the nation's war effort require that labor, the Roosevelt Democrats, as well as all patriotic Republicans, really conduct the election campaign in a spirit of national unity. This is a supreme necessity in order to consolidate the unity of the nation for the final military undertakings now being launched and for insuring the most stable internal political relations after the war. This is equally needed to help strengthen the post-war collaboration of the American-Soviet-British coalition, for securing the peace and solving the problems of reconversion and reconstruction.

Therefore, among other things, it is necessary now as never before to make clear that Roosevelt must be supported not because he is a Democrat and the candidate of the Democratic Party, but because he is a great patriot and the foremost

* Selection from a report delivered on July 27, at Chicago, to a Midwest conference of leaders of the Communist Political Association.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leader of the national interest and of the national coalition dedicated to victory. Roosevelt must be re-elected to ensure the continuation of his leadership as the vital and successful head of our nation's military effort, and as one of the great architects of the American-Soviet-British alliance, of the Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran conferences, which guarantee the way toward victory, a durable peace, and post-war security.

On the other hand, it must be made clear that labor and the popular forces oppose Dewey not because he is a Republican, which he is—nor because he is a fascist, which he is not.

Dewey is opposed because his election would bring into governmental power reactionary and defeatist forces that would impede the prosecution of the war and the attainment of complete victory. His election, therefore, would adversely affect America's relations with our Allies. It would obstruct the realization of measures designed to promote maximum production and employment after the war. It would engender unprecedented internal disunity and conflict and would aid the pro-fascists and the advocates of a "compromise" peace.

Furthermore, it must be made clear that the election of a Governor Thye or a Governor Baldwin must be opposed in spite of their personal integrity and win-the-war intentions, because a vote for them would bring strength to the Republican Presidential ticket, and therefore to the reactionary and pro-fascist forces behind Dewey and Bricker.

* * *

In applying the policy of national unity in the elections, greater attention needs to be given to the correct presentation of general issues and to the organization of non-partisan committees of the Negro people, of independent voters, of Willkie Republicans, etc., in support of the Government's victory program, of a Congress pledged to this program, and of the re-election of the President. However, special consideration should also be given to singling out a number of specific issues around which broad, non-partisan election movements can be developed. Among such issues are those pertaining to the soldiers' vote, registration, and the enactment of the principles of the Kilgore Bill.

For instance, in respect to the various campaigns now being launched to enable the members of the armed forces to vote, far greater attention must be given to organizing this movement on an *all-party* basis. The campaign for the soldiers' vote cannot be organized on the widest and most effective scale if it is projected and conducted simply as a partisan campaign to defeat Dewey and Bricker.

It is necessary, of course, that labor and all other patriotic forces should systematically expose the infamous role of Dewey and the Republican-Bourbon coalition in Congress in denying the soldiers the right and opportunity to vote. But this exposure must be supplemented

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the organization of a broad, national unity campaign to provide all servicemen with an opportunity to vote. An essential by-product of such a campaign and approach is and will be to unmask the role of Dewey, Dwight, Green, and the Republicans in Congress for the absence of a uniform and workable federal soldiers' ballot, and thereby to enlist greater support for Roosevelt. If the campaign for the soldiers' vote is developed in this way, as it has been in New York, then it will be possible to enlist and influence substantial Republican support. It will be possible to cross party lines and to strengthen national unity around the Commander-in-Chief.

Similarly, in respect to the question of registration. Labor, especially the C.I.O., is conducting a fairly effective campaign in certain communities to register war workers. In some areas the Democratic Party has begun a serious campaign to register and get out the vote. These campaigns should and must be continued, supported, and extended.

Nonetheless, it is already evident that these activities in themselves will not bring about the registration and voting of the majority of the non-registered voters, of the bulk of the war workers, nor of the passive, stay-away and undecided voters.

To secure a mass registration of tens of millions which is so essential to bring about victory in the elections for the camp of national unity, it is necessary to supplement the registration campaign of labor and the Democrats. It is necessary to form broad, non-party committees embracing Republicans, Democrats, trade unionists, Negroes, and civic leaders, which will launch concerted civic and community registration drives, and place the question of registration as a wartime obligation of all patriotic citizens in a fighting democracy.

A different kind of issue, but one of great importance, which likewise must be taken up and developed on a non-partisan basis, is the urgency of mobilizing the widest support for the principles of the Kilgore Bill, particularly in support of those measures which provide for an overall approach to the problems of reconversion and which will secure increased and extended unemployment insurance benefits for demobilized war workers and veterans.

According to reliable estimates, some two and one-third million war workers will be displaced during the last quarter of this year due to cutbacks and shifts in war schedules. So far, the Republican-Bourbon bloc in Congress has obstructed the enactment of legislation which would protect the demobilized war workers during the period of reconversion. One of their motives has been and is to try and place the responsibility for this situation on the Roosevelt government and to create discontent and division within the labor movement and among the supporters of Roosevelt.

In the interests of the nation and the needs of the workers laid off, in the interests of reducing the difficulties and dislocations of reconversion, *and* in the interests of the elections, it is high time that labor and the progressives developed a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

real crusade to provide for the "human factor" in demobilization. Here, what is most needed is the organization of a non-partisan campaign and movement involving trade unions, government agencies, community and industrial leaders, in support of the principles of the Kilgore Bill, to ensure full social security, rapid re-employment and expanded production.

Before leaving this principal point, it would be well to consider at least two other aspects of the problem of how most effectively to apply the policy of national unity in the current election situation. We must understand that an effective non-partisan election policy requires *something more* than the organization of non-partisan committees for the re-election of Roosevelt, as well as for the election of Congressmen who will consistently support the nation's program for victory, security and a durable peace. *It requires, among other things, that all win-the-war organizations employ and master a non-partisan approach and tactics.* This is particularly true in regard to the trade unions.

There can be no question but that many sections of labor, especially the C.I.O., are displaying greater understanding of the need and importance of applying a policy of national unity. This is evidenced in part by the position of the A. F. of L. state organizations in Pennsylvania, Ohio and Illinois, by the program of P.A.C. and the efforts of the C.I.O. to establish joint action with the A. F. of L., the Negro organizations, the Democrats, etc. It is evidenced by labor's united support in behalf of such Republicans as Burdick, Welch, Bennett, etc.

However, it must be stated that not only the A. F. of L., but even the most progressive wing of organized labor, the C.I.O., has not yet freed itself from partisanship in its election activity. *Labor as a whole has not yet succeeded in presenting and furthering its election program, which champions the national interests and victory, as a non-partisan matter, as a question of strengthening national unity.*

In matters of sponsoring, selecting and endorsing Congressional and local candidates, in questions concerning the organization and official leadership of various public campaigns, electoral and otherwise, the C.I.O. and P.A.C., as well as the A. F. of L., in many instances, do not yet evidence the necessary statesmanship, understanding and initiative to forge the broadest labor and national unity. Frequently many C.I.O. and A. F. of L. organizations and leaders are too concerned with narrow considerations of prestige and organizational control. They often confuse the basic question of strengthening labor's political influence and positions with that of capturing posts, securing nominations and dominating committees. *They often fail to see that by broadening and sharing leadership with labor's allies and collaborators, that labor's own welfare and strength, as well as the national interest, can and will be advanced.*

Moreover, quite frequently when representatives of labor or pro-labor candidates are nominated, the trade unions wage a narrow and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sectarian labor campaign in their behalf, primarily on the basis of calling for the election of labor and pro-labor candidates. Labor often loses sight of the fact that the nominees who are trade unionists are the representatives and candidates of the nation, the community and a consistent victory program, that precisely as trade unionists they can most loyally and effectively serve the interests of the nation at war and in the peace.

Clearly, to apply effectively and fully a policy of non-partisanship, of genuine national unity, it is necessary to understand that more is required than a non-party approach.

Thus, labor must rise above narrow, partisan, trade union interests and considerations. Labor, in its own interests and that of the nation and victory, must understand that narrow, one-sided labor political action will divide labor's ranks and repel and frighten labor's win-the-war and post-war allies.

This basic lesson and tactic needs to be learned and mastered everywhere, especially by some of the C.I.O. forces in New York, Michigan, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania. This will enable the C.I.O. and P.A.C. and the pro-Roosevelt forces in the A. F. of L. to strengthen labor's political role and influence, and *rapidly to extend the joint and parallel political activities of the C.I.O., A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods. It will enable labor to establish closer working relations and cooperative ties with the Roosevelt Democrats, Willkie Republicans, with the Negro people, the veterans' and women's organizations, and with the fraternal and nationality groups.*

* * *

Finally on this point, on the concrete application of the policy of national unity in the elections, the question is posed: is it still correct or possible for labor and the people to follow a policy of national unity in view of the fact that the largest aggregation of finance and industrial capital is supporting the Republican Presidential ticket?

Time does not permit a full and comprehensive answer to this important question. Therefore I would like to confine my remarks to certain limited aspects of the problem.

In approaching this question it is necessary to remember, first of all, that influential and powerful monopoly and financial interests, such as are represented by Stettinius, Taylor and Baruch, Lehman and Nathan Strauss, not only support the government's victory program, but are part of the Roosevelt Administration. This is a fact, and existing collaboration with these sections of Big Business in support of the Government's victory policies can and must be continued.

Secondly, it should be borne in mind that the Democratic Party, which rests upon, and is influenced by, labor's support and growing influence within the Administration and within the Democratic Party itself, is composed of a coalition which embraces powerful financial, industrial, and sectional group interests, as well as a series of local and state machines having vested financial and partisan interests. The Demo-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cratic Party as a whole is not yet a people's party. It is a bourgeois party — albeit a liberal-bourgeois party—pledged to the government's war and post-war policies, and subject to the influence of labor and the political re-alignments in the country.

It is a fact that labor is cooperating with the Democratic Party nationally and with those win-the-war sections of capital in and around it. In some areas labor is a part of or in close alliance with it. Certainly, no clear-thinking worker and advocate of national unity can question the need of continuing and developing this collaboration on the basis of supporting and implementing the Administration's anti-Axis program and the victory platform adopted by the national Democratic convention.

Next, we should keep in mind that those powerful reactionary and conservative sections of Big Capital supporting and comprising the leadership of the Republican Party are not one homogeneous whole, They do not represent a solid, unbreakable grouping.

Obviously, it is necessary to administer a decisive electoral defeat to these forces and their Presidential and Congressional ticket. But to accomplish this it is necessary to distinguish between those forces represented by the *Chicago Tribune* and those around the *New York Herald Tribune*. It is necessary to differentiate between the fascists and pro-fascists in and around the G.O.P. and those influenced by them.

At the same time it is necessary sharply and consistently to expose the selfish and shortsighted partisan and group interests which determine the policy of the *New York Herald Tribune* crowd. It is imperative to show how a Republican victory would not only jeopardize and negate the foreign policy which they espouse, but would endanger the very economic and class interests, the trade, capital investment, and profit interests which they desire to advance.

Further and most important, it is necessary to bear in mind that the position of such capitalists as Eric Johnston and Thomas Lamont, in the final instance, will not be settled either by their subjective intentions or by election arguments. Their position is and will be determined by pressing considerations of post-war trade, commerce, and capital exports, and, in the first place, by the relation of forces, internationally and within the country.

In respect to the latter, to the internal political situation, the position of organized labor and of our Association can be influential, and in some respects, decisive. This may be so if we make clear our position and program on national unity in the post-war period as well as during wartime, to help achieve a lasting peace and to solve the problems of post-war production, employment and security in the common national interest, and if we adhere firmly to labor's no-strike policy and develop this policy further in accord with the nation's post-war needs.

If all this is done, much can be achieved to break up the *unstable coalition* now supporting Dewey and Bricker and to influence important

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sections of Big Business now lined up behind the G.O.P. to participate in, or go along with, the camp of national unity after the elections.

* * *

In our everyday election work we sometimes get bogged down in a routine and neglect to react to big issues and events which often could open the doors to achieving wider unity and a greater mobilization of all win-the-war forces. For instance, D-Day provided an opportunity and necessitated a new approach to reach and rally additional forces—A. F. of L., Republican, etc., in active support of the Commander-in-Chief and our nation's war program. Yet insufficient attention was given to utilizing D-Day for this patriotic purpose.

Suffice it to say that more political alertness is required on our part to make use of all issues and events to forge and strengthen national unity for victory in the war and the elections.

For example, there should be an immediate reaction to Bricker's statement on Gerald L. K. Smith, so as to contact and influence the Willkie Republicans, A. F. of L. workers, Jewish people, and others, to condemn and reject this reactionary and pro-fascist move of the G.O.P. and to win wider sections of the people in support of Roosevelt.

Further, there should be an active response to the latest developments affecting the Poles. The rifts and differentiations now taking place in the Polish Government-in-exile on the basis of the Red Army's advances and the liberation of Polish soil, and the formation of the Polish National Liberation Council, can and must be utilized to help bring about a new, anti-Hitler alignment among Polish-Americans.

Labor Day should also be approached in a new way, along the lines of organizing broad community actions to participate in labor's salute to the armed forces and to our Commander-in-Chief.

In other words, it is necessary to approach all occasions, all events, big and small, in a new and fresh manner so as to find new allies and supporters who can establish common action on one or another point of common interest, so as to stimulate and foster greater unity of all win-the-war forces on a non-partisan basis around Roosevelt and for the election of a Congress pledged to support the government's war and post-war policies.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES ON THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

BY LOUIS F. BUDENZ

THE Democratic National Convention adopted a platform that begins with these words: "The Democratic Party stands on its record in peace and war." It is in fact the record of President Roosevelt himself, and of those legislators who supported him, which the platform claims for the party as a whole, and to which the whole party now becomes pledged. The record of Wheeler, Byrd, Bilbo, Reynolds, Cotton Ed Smith, Dies, Rankin, Cox, et al., was in effect repudiated by the convention, and the Democratic Party in this election stands on the record of its dominant, win-the-war and most forward-looking section. This is the answer to those "liberals" who fear that the reactionaries have taken over control of the Democratic Party. It is also the reason why millons of Republicans and independent voters, making up their minds on the basis of men and issues and rejecting partisan considerations, can be won for the Roosevelt-Truman ticket.

For with the nomination of President Roosevelt, and of the pro-Roosevelt and win-the-war Vice-Presidential candidate Senator Harry Truman, as well as in its platform, the Democratic Party as a whole rejected the counsels of its most reactionary and defeatist elements. Neither the convention, nor the ticket, nor the platform made any concession to them on the central issue: unqualified support for the grand strategy and all auxiliary measures for winning the war; full endorsement of all war and post-war commitments already made to our allies—in other words, it accepted the Teheran concord as the guide both to victory and peace.

Th struggle over the nomination of Vice-President Wallace was in no sense a conflict on this central issue. Despite their success in preventing his renomination, the anti-Roosevelt Democrats were not able to name a man of their own for second place on the ticket, nor even seriously to bring such a candidate before the convention. Senator Byrd, the unreconstructed rebels, and their Northern co-conspirators were obliged to take what cold comfort they could get from the pyrrhic victory of Wallace's defeat, won at the cost of themselves voting for Senator Truman, whose throat under happier circumstances they would have been glad to cut.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When the second ballot was recorded, the nation's most reactionary commentators, from Westbrook Pegler to Upton Close, drowned the press and radio in a sea of crocodile tears as they mourned the "passing" of Wallace, the C.I.O. Political Action Committee, and the Democratic Party itself.

But it soon became apparent that the wake was premature and the deaths much exaggerated. Wallace, by his principled fight and his uncompromising stand, particularly on the poll-tax issue, emerged with increased stature, and it is clear that he will campaign for the ticket with the clarity and vigor needed to inspire his most ardent supporters and overcome any apathy threatened by their disappointment in his defeat. Senator Truman brings real strength to the ticket. He has the support of the A. F. of L., small business, the farmers, and the Democratic machines. The C.I.O. and the most progressive Wallace supporters also know and respect him for his record, his loyalty to the President, and his contribution to the war. As the candidate of all these groups, Truman can cement their alliance with Roosevelt and help in overcoming divisions that still exist among the Roosevelt forces.

This was decidedly a war convention and by and large a convention of national unity. A war convention because the war and the needs of the war dominated its every major decision. A national unity convention because it became a dynamic expression of those movements and tendencies which represent the interests of the nation as a whole.

The keynote speech of Governor Robert S. Kerr of Oklahoma was a vigorous endorsement of the Roosevelt record, and an affirmation of faith in victory and the post-war collaboration of the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union and China. In answering the "tired old men" battlecry of the Republican convention, Governor Kerr paid high tribute to all our allies. Neither in this speech nor in any that followed was there any open or hidden Munichism or anti-Soviet poison. On the contrary, there was repeated acknowledgment of Russia's contribution to the defeat of the common enemy and praise for the leadership of her "much revered, world respected" Joseph Stalin. Red-baiting was conspicuous by its absence.

The New South spoke out more confidently in this Democratic National Convention, especially in the stirring speeches seconding the nomination of Vice President Wallace made by Gov. Ellis Arnal of Georgia and Senator Claude Pepper of Florida. Gov. Arnal, governor of a poll-tax state, said that "this is no time to go to Munich to pick a candidate"—and he spoke after Wallace had unequivocally condemned the poll-tax and called for full equality for the Negro people. This was the voice of the South that has retired Talmadge and Dies and Starnes and Cotton Ed Smith and Hattie Caraway from office, and that refused to retire Lister Hill and Claude Pepper. It is the South which is being spurred by the war against fascism to cleanse itself at last from the Hitlerite stigma of "white supremacy."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The emergence of this New South —signalized currently by the voting of 5,000 Negroes in the latest Arkansas primary—is a matter of hope to the whole nation, including specifically the Negro people. The ambiguous provision of the Democratic platform in regard to Negro rights was far from being what it should be, and exemplified the fact that the battle between the Bourbons and the anti-fascist South is still on. But the presence of the New South in the convention, the desperation of the Bourbons and polltaxers in the "revolts" they are staging, the fact that these revolts are against the enlightened policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt for the F.E.P.C. and for an end to the poll tax, the alliance of the Hoover-Taft-Dewey Republicans with the polltaxers, all bring home to progressive America and to the Negro people where the issues lie. They emphasize that it is around the re-election of the President and the implementation of the Teheran provisions that the hope for a democratic future for all America will be realized.

* * *

The Democratic platform as a whole is a national unity platform. It is pronouncedly free of those partisan and mutually contradictory appeals to social groups which have clogged so many such declarations. While this does not eradicate some of its all-too-obvious weaknesses, the weight of Roosevelt policies and the strength of Roosevelt interpretations can be relied upon to make this document one that can meet the test of the times. The President is not only the candidate of the Democratic Party, though that is the agency through which his candidacy is put forward. His is signally a non-partisan candidacy, in which the independent voters are also a part, including progressive-thinking Republicans, the C.I.O., and the A. F. of L. unions who were represented so well at the convention by President Daniel Tobin of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

The Democratic platform "cites action." It is an affirmation of faith in the perspectives for a world of security and international amity opened up at Teheran. In its own words—"To speed victory, establish and maintain peace, guarantee full employment and provide prosperity —this is the platform." And because the platform "cites action," because it stands on a record already written in deeds, the bright promise is not empty but carries real possibilities of its fulfillment. The Democratic platform acclaims and accepts all the steps already taken by President Roosevelt—from the Atlantic Charter to Teheran—to win and shorten the war, bring a lasting peace within reach, and further the realization of the perspectives of Teheran. The platform declares, "It [the Administration] gained for our country, and it saved for our country, powerful allies. When war came, it succeeded in working out with those allies an effective grand strategy against the enemy. It set that strategy in motion, and the tide of battle was turned."

The platform is strong and clear on the United Nations and its leading coalition of the United States,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Soviet Union and Great Britain; equally strong on the grand strategy of coalition warfare planned at Casablanca, Moscow, Cairo and Teheran and since set in motion by the successful invasion of Europe, the triumphal surge of the Red Armies toward Berlin, and the Pacific victories over Japan. The platform also endorses, and pledges to continue and improve, the other war measures initiated by Roosevelt and adopted over the bitter opposition of anti-Administration Republicans and Democrats—lend-lease, rationing and price control, selective service, the G.I. Bill of Rights, and other like issues.

The platform does not offer a detailed blueprint of post-war international organization. It correctly sees such an organization being forged in the process of winning the war itself. The platform says: "The primary and imperative duty of the United States is to wage the war with every resource available to final triumph over our enemies, and we pledge that we will continue to fight side by side with the United Nations until this supreme objective shall have been attained and thereafter to secure a just and lasting peace." Thus it accepts the United Nations, and its leading coalition, *as the only possible foundation* for a post-war international organization. And the platform then pledges the Democratic Party, without reservation, to support whatever further action, military and political, may be determined upon by the existing alliance in accord with the exigencies of the war and peace.

The platform promises to "uphold the Good Neighbor policy, and extend the trade policies initiated by the present administration." For Latin America, the guarantee that this pledge will be fulfilled lies partly in the record, but even more in the main content and direction of the platform—its assurance that the victory over fascism will be complete, that the three great powers of the anti-Hitler Coalition will continue and deepen their friendly cooperation, and that expanding trade in a stable world will bring industrialization and democracy to all the countries of the western hemisphere. Our 130,000,000 neighbors to the South have no vote in our November elections. But we cannot ignore the voice of their needs and desires, for they are a sizable section of those hundreds of millions of customers around the world whose good-will and purchasing power will be decisive for our own prosperity. The Good Neighbor policy, despite weaknesses, has gone some distance toward undoing the harm done by the dollar diplomacy and Yankee imperialism of Harding-Coolidge-Hoover. The whole of the Democratic platform, as well as its Good Neighbor plank, is a pledge to continue and expand policies which will not only strengthen hemisphere unity and further the interests of the other Americas, but realize Latin America's vast potential for contributing to full production and full employment in its countries and in the United States.

In dealing with Puerto Rico, that key to Latin American confidence in the future good faith of our policy toward the other Americas, the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Democratic platform falls short of what is needed. It does however, at least by implication, take into account the strong and growing demand of the Puerto Ricans for their independence. Where the Republican platform offers the reactionary, unpopular and specious solution of "statehood," the Democratic platform favors "enactment of legislation granting the fullest measure of self-government." That is not, unfortunately, a pledge of the independence implicit in the Atlantic Charter and the Declaration of Teheran. But the Puerto Ricans cannot hope to win independence by junking the Charter and the Declaration, or by leaving their destiny in the hands of those who, like the Republicans in the present Congress, are recorded as opposing even the right to elect the Governor of Puerto Rico as proposed by President Roosevelt.

The platform cites with justifiable pride the record of labor and social legislation which saved the American economy from the near fatal sickness to which twelve years of Old Guard Republican rule had brought it. That record need not be reviewed here. It is a record of progressive measures adopted over the bitterest opposition—from Republicans and anti-Roosevelt Democrats.

The C.I.O. with its Political Action Committee was only one of the many representatives of the new popular political activity of the masses present in the convention, though it was one of the best organized and certainly the most publicized. According to the newspapers, P.A.C. dominated the convention—and took a most terrible beating. This wonderful paradox did not at all confound those who adopted it and who prefer it to the unpleasant truth that the C.I.O., Philip Murray, the Political Action Committee, and Sidney Hillman neither dominated nor went down to defeat, but merely participated as spokesmen for a large and organized section of the population which, like most of the delegates, wants speedy victory in the war, a lasting peace, post-war prosperity, and the guarantee of their attainment through the re-election of President Roosevelt. Since the convention, the "terrible defeat" part of the paradox has been pretty well abandoned. Now the press (and the Dewey strategists) are all out to save the Democratic Party from "C.I.O.-Communist rule." P.A.C. and the National Citizens Political Action Committee are being credited with astronomical slush funds, unlimited power, and secret treaties with Roosevelt which will turn over the country to them lock, stock, and barrel—unless Dewey rides up on a white horse to save us all in November.

Such wily means are designed to frighten many business, middle class, farm, and A. F. of L. elements away from the Roosevelt-Truman ticket. Sidney Hillman's recent denunciation of this "endeavor to divide the unity of the pro-Roosevelt forces with the distorted accusation that the P.A.C. seeks to capture the Democratic Party and Congress" is therefore most timely and salutary.

It is to labor's credit that its influence in the Democratic conven-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion was exerted in the interest of the whole nation, not to further narrowly the interests of the workers alone. Labor took its bearings from the star of Teheran. In the same way the contribution of the Negro people was more than a defense and furthering of the special interests of an oppressed minority—it was a contribution to the unification of the majority of the nation for victory and an insistence on the solution of problems which obstruct the fullest mobilization of the nation's energies and hamper its relations with its allies.

While this was true politically and programmatically, it did not find full organized expression, even among all of the popular forces in the convention. Failure of the A. F. of L., C.I.O., Negro, and farm delegates to work more fully together and pool their strength in completely organized fashion retarded their full effectiveness. The broader unity being welded in states and localities has still to be achieved on a national and even broader scale.

Nevertheless, many old prejudices were shed or weakened at the Democratic National Convention, which itself carried the spirit of Teheran a step farther into our national life. It demonstrated that forward-looking victory-minded folk of all groups and classes can unite in a supreme effort to reach the common goal. Now that the Republican and Democratic conventions are over, it remains to realize fully all that is inherent in that possibility—to move from "can unite" to "have united." And that is a task that requires of all of us that we rise above narrow party considerations, appealing on a wholly non-partisan basis to *all* Americans who see in Roosevelt the leader of a nation rather than the titular head of a party, and who will choose among candidates those of whatever party who have proved their willingness and ability to support the Roosevelt program for victory, lasting peace, and prosperity. In this great task there is no question of labor, and least of all the P.A.C., "taking over" the Democratic Party or displacing the machine which is still a fact of American political life that must be realistically accepted by anybody who carries on an election campaign with the intention of *winning it*. The Democratic machine is committed to the Roosevelt-Truman ticket. There are many Republicans, even some machine Republicans, who can be won to that ticket. And in the process of uniting all those forces, Democrats, Republicans, independents, trade unionists, farmers, businessmen big and little, and the Negro people, we shall be building a "machine" new to American politics —the machine of unity for victory and lasting peace. That machine can become a bandwagon for all who want Roosevelt in the driver's seat these next four crucial years. And we must help to make it so by asking no more of any American willing to ride with us than, "Going our way?"

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEGRO AND THE ELECTIONS

BY DOXEY A. WILKERSON

WHETHER we move forward to complete victory in this war, and to the achievement of that enduring peace and world security promised at Teheran, indeed, whether there shall continue to be a free and democratic America, *may* be decisively determined by the votes of Negro citizens on November 7. Likewise, whether the notable wartime gains of the Negro people shall be consolidated and extended in the period after the war *will* be decisively determined by the outcome of the Presidential and Congressional elections this fall.

It is from both of these points of view that the masses of all Americans must now be led to understand the crucial role of the Negro people in the wartime elections of 1944.

I

The military phase of the war hastens to its conclusion during the height of the election campaign. Both are a part of the same struggle —for the destruction of fascism and the building of abiding peace and security for all men. Both, therefore—on the battlefield and the home front—must be decisively won.

Our victories on the field of battle will mean little unless they are consolidated by policies and program consistent with the goals for which we fight. To assure that our country will continue to promote such policies and programs requires the election of the Roosevelt-Truman ticket and a progressive win-the-war, win-the-peace Congress. And this, in turn, requires the continued support of the vast majority of Negro voters for the Roosevelt Administration.

Potential Balance of Power

The majority of the Negro voting population outside of the South is concentrated in a small number of great industrial cities—New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and a few others. As has been repeatedly demonstrated during recent years, this is politically a highly mature group of voters, especially alert to issues of especial concern to the Negro people. Moreover, this Negro vote is strategically located in states where the election contest is most closely drawn. It may well hold the balance of power in the coming elections.

Despite some of the misleading inferences of *PM*'s recent analysis of "The Negro Vote in November" (August 13), its tabulations of po-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tential Negro voting strength in selected states correctly define the crucial importance of the Negro vote in the coming elections. That analysis showed that in each of eight states which could prove decisive in November (New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Missouri, New Jersey, Michigan, and Indiana), the potential Negro vote is larger than the margin of votes between Willkie and Roosevelt in the 1940 elections. These eight states control 202 electoral votes, more than three-fourths the number necessary to decide the Presidential contest.

It is by no means an exaggeration, therefore, to assert that the Negro vote may elect the next President of the United States. And considering the decisive role of our country in the war and post-war reconstruction, it is equally true that for the whole new perspective opened up to the world by the Anglo-Soviet-American concord at Teheran the vote of Negro Americans on November 7 will be a determining factor.

Thus, Negro voters in 1944 are not merely "another" group to be considered. They constitute one of the most important sectors of this electorate. As Eugene Dennis pointed out in "The Decisive Three Months" (*Daily Worker*, August 12): "As never before the Negro vote will be one of the decisive factors in the elections."

What Will Win the Negro Vote?

Partisan propaganda seeks to build up the myth of a great shift of the Negro vote—from overwhelming support of Roosevelt (in increasing proportions during 1932, 1936 and 1940) to majority support for Dewey. Despite the defections of a few large Negro papers, there is no evidence of such a general shift in the Negro voting population. The truly outstanding leaders of the Negro people are overwhelmingly for the Roosevelt-Truman ticket, and pro-Roosevelt sentiment among the masses of Negro workers is even more pronounced.

Yet it would be a grave error for Roosevelt supporters to assume that the decisive Negro vote is "in the bag." That vote is increasingly nonpartisan and independent. It can be guaranteed for Roosevelt and Truman only if serious attention is given to correcting the outstanding grievances of the Negro people and to clearing up the confusions being created by Republican propaganda. There are several main issues around which such efforts must center.

First, the recurring brutality of military and civilian police to Negro soldiers in the South, together with still existing and flagrant discriminations in the armed forces themselves, must quickly be stopped. There is no issue which more angers the Negro people than this. Despite the notable improvements the Roosevelt Administration has made in this regard, and despite the limitations which would face *any* administration at this time, clever propagandists can, and will, use this legitimate grievance of the Negro people as a means of channeling their political allegiance away from the administration in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power. The Roosevelt Administration must act, through both executive and legislative means, to remove this festering sore from the body of national unity. Progressive groups, and especially labor, must place agitation to this end in the very forefront of their programs.

Second, special measures must be adopted to meet the special problem faced by Negro workers during the period of reconversion. Most of the million or more Negro war workers have only limited seniority because of the racial bars that kept them from employment during the early stage of the war. For these Negroes, "the last hired" again to become "the first fired" when cutbacks are more general would be truly disastrous. This threat to their living standards might well lead to conflicts which would split the trade unions wide open on the racial issue, to riots and bloodshed in great industrial areas, and to a serious shift of Negro voting support from the Roosevelt Administration. In its own interests and in the larger interests of the nation, the trade union movement must come to grips with this problem and take the initiative in its solution. Some means must be devised, preferably through labor-management-government action, to prevent Negro workers from bearing a disproportionate share of the unemployment which the transitional period of reconversion is bound to bring.

Third, the trade union movement must throw its whole power into the destruction of Jim Crowism on the job and in the community. Thus can the unions best wipe out that latent anti-Negroism among backward elements of their membership which lays organized labor and the nation open to such enemy attacks as in the recent transit strike in Philadelphia. Thus can the unions best unify their own ranks against the plots of race-baiting disrupters, and at the same time greatly enhance their bargaining effectiveness for all workers. Thus can the trade union movement most surely enlist the support of the Negro people in the campaign for the election of Roosevelt and Truman. Thus, truly, can labor rise unitedly in the discharge of its responsibilities as the backbone of the national unity.

Fourth, the anti-Negro poll-taxers in the Democratic Party must consistently be attacked as common enemies of the Roosevelt Administration and the nation. The concessions made to them by the Democratic National Convention must be frankly admitted, and then counterbalanced by the more substantial defeats they there received and *others they must receive in the months ahead.* Their unholy Congressional alliance with Hoover-Dewey Republicans must at every stage be revealed and assailed. Their vicious attacks upon the Negro people in the halls of Congress must be answered with such vigor and such consistency that they no longer come to pollute the atmosphere of our national legislature and sorely offend the Negro people and all decent Americans.

These tasks are but illustrative of the necessary approach to *assuring* overwhelming Negro support for the Roosevelt-Truman ticket in the fall

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elections. This is no program here set forth solely "for the advancement of the Negro people." This is a program which now must be viewed as absolutely necessary *for the continued advancement of our nation and the world.* It must be undertaken as such by labor and the progressive forces generally who realize how basically essential the victory of Roosevelt in the fall elections is to assure that destruction of fascism and that enduring peace and security which the triumph of Allied arms on the field of battle have now brought almost within our grasp.

II

What the coming elections mean for the future of Negro freedom and security can best be understood in the light of those influences which have advanced and retarded the Negro's struggle for this historic goal since the Civil War. Especially revealing are the Negro's experiences during the past (Roosevelt) decade.

Slavery, Freedom—Then New Forms of Oppression

For more than three hundred years the Negro people have been struggling to destroy the bonds which make them less than free men. They fought back in numerous ways during the two and one-half centuries of slavery. They were a major force in preserving the Union and winning their own freedom during the Civil War. Together with new white allies in the progressive days of Reconstruction, they set out to build the first and only democratic people's state governments the South has ever known.

Then came the reaction of the late 1870's. Under the newly elected President Hayes, the Republican Party betrayed the democratic revolution which the forces around Lincoln had won, abandoning the Negro people to violent and "legal" subjugation by the leaders of the defeated Confederacy. The long and evil decades which followed left the Negro landless, disfranchised, thoroughly Jim Crowed, barred from all but the most menial and degrading employment, and with little or no opportunity for education.

The first real "break" in this semi-feudal oppression came during and after World War I, when one and three-fourths million Negroes left the South for the freer society and unprecedented industrial opportunities of the North. But even the new spark of hope then engendered was soon extinguished by post-war mass firings, race riots, lynchings, and the spread of Jim Crowism throughout the country. Even the inconsequential Republican Party of the South, through which Negro politicians dispensed patronage when the national G.O.P. was in power, was then purged of all but a few of its Negro leaders by the "lily-white" policy revived by President Hoover.

These setbacks for the Negro people were greatly intensified by the economic crisis of 1929. Three successive Republican administrations had sought to pyramid profits for the corporations at the expense of the living standards of the people, with the result that disaster con-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fronted the nation as a whole, and the conditions and perspectives of the Negro people became exceedingly grave indeed.

The Period of the Depression

Not until the do-nothing policies of "Hooverism" were supplanted by the Roosevelt "New Deal" was there any reversal of this downward trend for the Negro people. Ever since then the Negro's march toward freedom and security has moved forward at an accelerating pace.

The policies of President Roosevelt during the depression years tremendously weakened and began the disintegration of the over-all encrusted pattern of American caste, thereby laying the basis for the rapid advances of the Negro peoples today. It is well to summarize the main achievements of the Roosevelt Administration during this period, for they are highly relevant to the election campaign of 1944.

First, the Roosevelt Administration greatly relieved what would otherwise have been the unbearable economic plight of the Negro people during the period of the depression. Millions of Negro citizens, who were hardest hit by unemployment and its attendant ills, obtained jobs, direct relief, decent housing, and home and farm security through such programs as P.W.A., W.P.A., N.Y.A., C.C.C., A.A.A., U.S.H.A., and F.S.A. Moreover, every one of these federal agencies introduced, with varying degrees of effectiveness, the explicit policy of no discrimination on account of race. They were unable to stamp out all discrimination, especially in the South, but they definitely decreased it. Thereby, they enormously enlarged the Negro's share in public services and established the all-important *principle* that Negro citizens, even in the South, are entitled to share equitably in the benefits of such federal programs.

Second, the Roosevelt Administration greatly advanced the educational opportunities of the Negro people. W.P.A.'s gigantic adult education program taught 400,000 Negroes to read and write and gave profitable employment to many thousands of Negro teachers, for whom it tried (with some success) to require salary scales equal to those of white teachers in the South. P.W.A. spent $7,000,000 in Negro school building construction in the South, a tremendous advance despite the fact that white schools got proportionately more. Many thousands of Negro youth were enabled to continue their education through the highly equalitarian program of the N.Y.A., and Negro graduate students were provided special scholarship grants of a type not available to white students. The Agricultural Extension Service, the Farm Security Administration, and other agencies made similar substantial contributions to the education of the Negro people. (Incidentally, what would have been the crowning achievement in this regard—passage of the federal aid-to-education bill proposed by the President's Advisory Committee on Education, with absolute safeguards for Negro schools—was prevented only by the legislative trickery of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senator Taft and his Republican colleagues.)

Third, the Roosevelt Administration markedly increased the employment of Negroes in federal service. Not only were appreciable gains made in white-collar and other higher paid categories, but (reversing the policies of the preceding Republican administrations) unprecedented numbers of well-qualified Negroes were appointed, on the basis of merit, to important administrative and policy-making positions in the federal government.

Fourth, the Roosevelt Administration introduced other basic social reforms of immense importance to the Negro people. Federal social security and minimum-wages-and-hours legislation brought benefits of major significance to the traditionally underpaid and insecure masses of Negro workers. Guarantees of collective bargaining rights and other enlightened labor policies fostered the growth of union membership from 3,000,000 to 14,000,000, furthered the integration of Negro workers into the labor movement (especially C.I.O.) — which has proved to be the staunchest ally of the Negro people—and made possible the increasing progressive influence of labor on the political life of the nation.

Fifth, the Roosevelt Administration gave birth to a new labor and progressive movement in the South, which is destined yet to destroy the centuries-old feudalistic controls that have so long oppressed the great masses of Negro Americans. Industrialization and agricultural reform are undermining the very foundations of Bourbon rule. Thousands of federal appointees have brought a new type of public servant to the South, men and women of education and training whose primary concern is not to "keep the Negro in his place," but to advise and help him to a better life. The political influence of the poll-taxers on national policy (although still dangerous) has been lessened in numerous ways. Negroes and organized labor play an ever-increasing role in Southern politics. One by one, the most reactionary Southern diehards (Garner, Talmadge, Smith, Dies, Starnes, Reynolds, Caraway, etc.) are being eliminted from public life; and such new and progressive Southerners as Pepper, Hill, Arnall, and Fulmer are emerging into political prominence. The South is now in the process of a new Reconstruction, and the policies of the Roosevelt Administration during the depression laid the very foundations of this most salutary development for the Negro people.

These are basic and far-reaching achievements. It is no wonder that Gunnar Myrdal's *An American Dilemma* (the most fundamental and comprehensive study yet made of the "Negro problem") concludes:

"It can be generally ascertained that, as a result of the relative growth of the federal budget and the increased responsibility for and control of public services by federal agencies, discrimination has been decreasing during the New Deal" (p. 331).

And again:

"Not overlooking the considerable

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discrimination against Negroes in the local administration of New Deal measures in the South, we must see that the New Deal has made a lasting break in Southern racial practices" (p. 463).

The Period of the People's War

For the first time since the Hayes-G.O.P. betrayal of 1876, the policies of the first two Roosevelt administrations brought a decisive and sustained upward sweep of the curve of social progress for the Negro people. The trend then initiated has been tremendously accelerated by the win-the-war policies of the third Roosevelt administration during the period of the anti-Axis war.

A million or more Negro men and women now earn good wages in war jobs in most of which only white workers were employed before. The unprecedented and bitterly fought Fair Employment Practices Committee (F.E.P.C.) continues to pry open new employment opportunities for the Negro people—and, as during the recent transit strike in Philadelphia, is backed up solidly by President Roosevelt in every one of its successive crises. Equal Negro-white wage scales have been established by W.P.B. Hundreds of thousands of Negro unionists are forging new bonds of comradeship with their white fellow workers on the production lines and in the political arena.

Despite still existing discriminations and abuse, Negroes are fighting gloriously for their country in every branch of the armed services. Progressively, the most flagrant discriminations are being destroyed—in the Merchant Marine, Navy, Air Corps, WACS, and Army Nurse Corps. Those that remain must be fought against with all the power the progressive forces of our nation can muster. Not only *ought* they go, but with the strengthening of the Roosevelt Administration they *can* be wiped off the face of America.

Traditional Jim Crow bars in public places are being subjected to tremendous strain, even in the South. A Negro is appointed White House Correspondent, another to the staff of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, another as Assistant National Chairman of the National Democratic Party. The "white primary" has been declared unconstitutional by the U. S. Supreme Court, and a veritable political renaissance is under way among Negro voters in the South. A Negro Communist is elected to the City Council of New York, and another New York Negro wins primary election contests for nomination to Congress on the tickets of the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, and the American Labor Party!

There remain many dastardly slave survivals still to be destroyed. Negro boys in uniform still suffer gross indignities and abuse. Racial barriers to employment still abound. The rotten Bourbon oligarchy which controls the South still fights desperately to bolster up its tottering rule, even to the extent of trying to destroy F.E.P.C. and challenging the decree of the highest court of the land that Negroes must be allowed to vote in the heretofore

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"white primaries" of the southern states. Complete freedom still lies far ahead, and can be achieved only through firm unity and struggle of the Negro people in alliance with labor and other pro-Roosevelt forces of the nation. But the truly substantial gains which the Negro people have made under the wartime Roosevelt Administration are the most significant strides forward since that brief and promising decade following the Civil War.

The Elections and the Post-war Period

Now, as this war hastens to its conclusion, the Negro stands on the threshold of a new era of freedom and security. For the first time in the history of our country, it is now possible to foresee in the near future the achievement of full democratic rights for the Negro people. *Will that perspective actually be realized in the years immediately ahead?* This is a basic issue which the fall elections will do more than anything else to decide.

What are the alternatives which confront Negro voters in the fall elections?

On the one hand, they can continue their support for the Roosevelt Administration and the policies with which it is identified. Those policies include:

1. The speedy defeat of our Axis enemies and the complete destruction of fascism (the basic requirements for peace in the world, and especially for the very survival of minority racial groups):

2. The strengthening of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition to hasten victory and lay a solid basis for a cooperative United Nations world organization which has both the will and the power to guarantee enduring peace and progressively enlarged freedom for all men (without which there is no possibility of freedom and security for the Negro people);

3. Increased *federal* planning and administration over such social functions of government as full post-war employment, unemployment insurance, public housing and health services, etc. (the only practical means of preventing the gross anti-Negro discrimination which control of these programs by southern states would surely bring);

4. Strengthening the labor unions as the backbone of democratic national unity, and (quoting Earl Browder's *Teheran—Our Path in War and Peace,* p. 85) "further uniting them, and securing their participation in all public affairs up to and including national and international policy-making and administration" (thus giving added power to the staunchest ally of the Negro in his struggle for full democratic rights);

5. Further stimulation of southern industrialization and agricultural reform (which will destroy the economic base of the oppressive feudalistic oligarchy now in control of the South);

6. Support for the growing labor and progressive movement in the South (which is necessary in order to retire from public life the poll-tax enemies of both the President and the Negro people);

7. Extension of the franchise in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the South (by enforcement of the Supreme Court "white primary" ban and Congressional repeal of the poll-tax barriers in the immediate future);

8. Progressive elimination of anti-Negro discrimination in the armed forces (despite the strenuous opposition with which the major steps already taken were met);

9. Continued strengthening of F.E.P.C. and other direct anti-discrimination policies and programs (which the Roosevelt Administration first introduced into twentieth-century America—with inestimable benefit to the Negro people); and

10. Further extension and expression of the fundamental principle that the primary function of government is to safeguard and promote the welfare of the common man.

It is precisely this philosophy of government and these policies which revived the forward march of the Negro people during the period of the New Deal, and which gave it added impetus and strength during the period of the anti-fascist war. It is Roosevelt, the author of these policies, and the progressive labor and other groups by which he is supported that can best be counted on to consolidate and extend the recent progress which the Negro people have made toward their historic goal of full democratic rights.

On the other hand, the Negro people can swing their support to Dewey and the policies with which (insofar as can be determined from the character of his backers and his ultra-cautious and contradictory pronouncements) his administration would be identified. Those policies include:

1. Narrow partisan disruption of the war effort with probable appeasement and "negotiation" with our fascist enemies (which is what brings Dewey the support of such native pro-fascists as Hearst, McCormick, and Gerald L. K. Smith);

2. Disruption of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition on the phony pretext of protecting the interests of "small nations" (which would thus strengthen the hand of the most reactionary sections of American imperialists who seek to dominate the world, and who would precipitate thereby another and even more disastrous world war);

3. State control over unemployment insurance, social security and other social functions of government (which is the thing that endears Dewey to the southern poll-taxers who stop at nothing in order to defeat Roosevelt and return the Negro to his pre-New Deal subjection);

4. Weakening the influence of organized labor in public affairs and in collective bargaining (thus assuring greater profits for the corporations, lowered living standards for the workers, and added strength for the pro-fascist forces within our country);

5. Maintaining a feudalistic South (which can serve as a sort of semi-colonial source of cheap raw materials for the industrial North);

6. Strengthening the Bourbon poll-tax rule in the South (as a means of defeating the "New Reconstruction" set into motion by the Roosevelt Administration);

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

7. Demogagic double-talk about improving the lot of the Negro people (while the *deeds* of Dewey and his supporters are effectively knifing the Negro and all that he cherishes in the back); and

8. Revival of the Hoover policy of a rough-rider government for the benefit of those who own the nation's wealth—and the rest of the people be damned.

It is precisely this philosophy of government and these policies which most seriously endanger the Negro's prospects of continued progress toward freedom and security during and after the war. It is the small stature and big ambitions of men like Dewey, and the even more sinister forces of reaction which now rally to his support, that would check and sharply reverse the current trend toward the Negro's historic goal of full democratic rights.

Thomas E. Dewey has all the qualifications of a President Hayes, and could be relied upon to repeat in 1945 the Republican betrayal of 1876, which consigned the Negro people to seven long decades of degradation and abuse.

Franklin D. Roosevelt has *demonstrated* over a period of more than a decade his unswerving purpose to strengthen democracy and economic security for the masses of Americans in general, and to use the power of government progressively to destroy the special economic and social and political bonds which shackle the Negro people.

Let the reactionary or unthinking political propagandists shout all they will about an alleged swing of the Negro vote to Dewey. Let certain Negro papers prostitute their social mission for whatever material or other rewards they may obtain for their services to the G.O.P. The coming elections will prove all this to have been in vain.

The masses of Negroes who cast their ballots on November 7 will speak for a people whose experiences during the "New Deal" and the wartime Roosevelt Administrations—and before!—have brought them to a high level of political maturity. They can no longer be fooled by double-talk; their vote cannot be bought; and they have nothing but contempt for the Negro party hacks who now seek to guide them to their own disaster.

These three million Negro voters naturally belong in the Roosevelt-Truman camp in the coming elections. They know that the Roosevelt Administration and the labor movement from which it gains major support have done more to advance Negro freedom than any influence since the dark days following Reconstruction. Their normal inclination is to support that national leadership which has proved to be their staunchest friend. This decisive Negro vote actually *can* be won for the Roosevelt-Truman ticket—and it *must* be won if the strong progressive, democratic trend now emerging in our nation and the world is to be strengthened until effective dominance is achieved.

The goal of peace and security for the world, through achievement of the Teheran objectives, and the goal of freedom for the Negro people through attainment of full democratic rights, have now be-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

come inseparably merged. Each is dependent upon the other, and both are fundamentally at stake in the fall elections. It is important that the Negro people be led fully to understand that the continued national leadership of the Roosevelt Administration is absolutely essential for the consolidation and extension of their wartime gains. It is even more important that labor and the other pro-Roosevelt forces of the country come quickly to understand that the attainment of the democratic goals which they seek now requires vigorous and incessant struggle, in firm unity with the Negro people, to destroy the Jim Crow curse on America which in this period of history has come to imperil the peace and security of the entire world.

The Task of the Communists

The national and world importance of assuring maximum support for the Roosevelt-Truman ticket in the fall elections by the crucial millions of Negro voters poses a special task for Marxists. It is a task which gains added significance from the fact that it comes just at the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Communist organization in our country.

Marxists have always understood better than any group in our society the fundamental necessity of unity between white and Negro Americans for the freedom and security of both and of the nation as a whole. The famous Civil War dictum of Karl Marx—"Labor with a white skin cannot be free where labor in a black skin is branded"—has ever been a controlling premise underlying the program of the Communist organization.

Now, as these national elections and this anti-Axis war of which they are a part hasten to their conclusion, our country has greater need than ever before for the fullest possible expression of the principle of Negro-white unity in the interests of winning the war for the utter destruction of fascism. And it is the Marxists within the camp of national unity who must assume it as a major responsibility to help all the democratic forces of the nation translate that principle into life.

The task we now face is far greater than was Scottsboro or the hundreds of other instances in which Communists have struggled against the Jim-Crow threat to the welfare of all Americans. The task of uniting the Negro people with labor and the progressive movement generally to *assure* that the Roosevelt policies of national and United Nations unity will continue to guide our country is now the task of guaranteeing that the whole new perspective that this liberating war and the concord of Teheran have brought into being is actually achieved in the difficult period of struggle ahead.

Let Communists approach the question of "The Negro and the Elections" with full appreciation of the crucial importance of the contribution they, of all others, are best equipped to make. There could be no more fitting way to observe the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Communist organization in the United States.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHINA'S REAL DESTINY

BY FREDERICK V. FIELD

[*We are pleased to present to our readers the following article written by an authority on Far Eastern Affairs, formerly Secretary of the American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, and at present a member of its Executive Board. Mr. Field is the author of two volumes and many articles on the Far East. —The Editors.*]

TWO months ago, as China entered upon the eighth year of organized resistance to the Japanese invader, the great strategic city of Changsha had fallen to the enemy. Japanese columns were spreading south along the railway to Canton and outward to deny the defenders the use of bases from which the extended supply routes could be successfully attacked.

It was under such circumstances that at his press conference last July 7 President Roosevelt expressed the view that the war in China was not going well. Reporters conveyed the impression that the President felt confident of the long-term outcome. The Japanese were being pushed from the toehold in India, key points on the supply routes from Burma into China were being recovered, the foe's shipping facilities were being crippled at a higher rate than replacements, and the victories of the forces under Admiral Nimitz and General MacArthur were breaking through the island fortress with which Japan had surrounded itself.

The President's conclusions, according to the *New York Times* correspondent were "that the Japanese strategic situation was not very good, but he [the President] again called attention to the fact that Chinese resistance had not been very great."

The failure of the Chinese forces to stop the spring and summer drive of heavily outnumbered Japanese troops down the railway which bisects China north and south and runs from Peiping through Chengchow, Hankow, Changsha, Hengyang and on to Canton has caused grave concern, not only in China, but among China's allies as well. And this concern has not been lessened by the complacency of the Chungking bureaucracy or by the official news releases of Chinese military successes which have been disproved before the words that conveyed them have been read by foreign readers. It has become widely known, for instance, that half a million Kuomintang troops in the immediate vicinity of the Loyang-Chengchow area, where the current campaign for the north-south railway line began, failed to engage the enemy until too late. And why? Be-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause the task as well as inclination of their commander, General Hu Tsung-nan, was not to resist the fascist invader but rather to blockade the spread of democracy and organized resistance to the Japanese from the Chinese guerrilla base in the Northwest Autonomous Border Region. General Hu's chief of staff, Lo Tse-kai, who was interviewed by American correspondents on their way to the guerrilla capital, Yenan, attempted to divert foreign attention from the true nature of the situation by blaming the Communist troops for the Japanese success. His miscalculation was the simple one of not realizing that the American correspondents already had in their possession information as to the continued and heroic activity of the Communist-led troops against the enemy as well as knowledge that these particular Kuomintang troops had never yet in the seven years of war engaged the Japanese.

The Issues Involved

The issue raised by the current military crisis in China is not that of the valor of the Chinese soldier, or his willingness to face the enemy regardless of the odds; nor is it the question of the eagerness of the Chinese people, civilian and military alike, to serve their nation in this fatal hour of decision. The courage and patriotism of the Chinese people are already recorded in the pages of history, in the world-wide struggle to smash fascism, in the hearts of their millions of allies in the United States, in Great Britain, in the Soviet Union.

The issue is the national unity of the Chinese people; the ending of the state of disunity whose continued existence strengthens the Japanese invader. What is at stake is the speedy, efficient conclusion of the war. The issue is whether or not China shall play the full, vigorous, and essential role in the Allied military effort on which speedy and decisive victory depends; whether or not China shall play a positive role in the post-war reconstructive tasks of the Allied coalition. In the process of participating in victory will China achieve genuine national independence? Will she emerge from the trial of battle a free and independent nation, unified within, and prepared to play a leading role in the final stages of the war (as she did in its early stages) and in the establishment of the peace? Or, will China emerge as a semi-colony, burdened by internal dissension, by the remnants of a bureaucratic feudalism, economically and politically dependent upon and subject to the capitalist powers?

These are not questions which, as certain Chungking apologists would have us believe, involve merely a "family quarrel." They are infinitely more serious than that. The issue presented by the Chinese situation is one which involves American boys dying on the battlefields of Asia and the Pacific, it is one which jeopardizes victory over Japan, it is one which threatens the ability of the United Nations to establish post-war security, it is one which endangers the possibility of an expanding world economy and consequently the question of domestic employment in the United States.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Just as surely as the political threat now being made within our country by isolationist-imperialists is the concern of Englishmen, Russians, and Chinese, so is the internal condition of China the concern of all the rest of us.

Pursuing this point a further step, consider the relation of the future Chinese economy to American jobs. In *Teheran—Our Path in War and Peace,* Earl Browder writes:

"It is a demonstrable fact that the economic policies characteristic of 'Kuomintang' China today are operating to defeat America's interest in an expanding Chinese market, while the economic policies of 'Communist' China are those most favorable and conducive to an expanding market. The anti-democratic, authoritarian internal regime of 'Kuomintang' China is based upon economic policies which cultivate landlordism, speculation, market monopoly, usury, and all sorts of profit-seeking *not through expanding the economy but by parasitically preying upon economy.* The democratic internal regime of the Northwest Border Region, the so-called 'Communist' China, is based upon economic policies which limit and reduce landlord exploitation, prohibit speculative hoarding and 'cornering of markets,' give free play to economic enterprise in productive fields, defeat usurious practices, and *encourage profit-seeking only through the expansion of production and in forms which raise the economic level of the entire community"* (p. 48-49).

Mr. Browder asks: "Is this, then, in reality a 'purely domestic issue' of China, toward which America is not entitled to have a policy?"

Being very much our business, it is incumbent upon us to analyze and understand the nature of the Chinese crisis. Only then can we gauge the problem of American policy toward our Chinese ally.

There are three main roads which the Chinese nation can follow in the immediate future. One leads in the direction of greater unity, greater democracy, an enhanced war effort for the speedy defeat of Japan, a more positive military and political role in the coalition of the United Nations. A second leads in the opposite direction and would involve a consolidation of the already powerful position of reaction. A third and hardly less disastrous alternative than the second would see the virtual collapse of central authority and a breaking up of the nation into a semi-feudal regionalism. What are the trends in the relationship of forces within China?

Bureaucratic Feudalism

Since China has been at war a change has occurred in the relationship of forces supporting the national government and the leadership of the Kuomintang and from this change has arisen the critical situation in which the country now finds itself. Almost all else that has happened in China in the last four or five years can be traced directly to this basic alteration in the balance of forces.

The national government and Kuomintang of pre-1937 China represented a combination of what has been loosely called the "old" and the "new" China. The big landowners, the money-lenders — usurers — and the feudal bureaucracy had a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sort of tacit working agreement with the new bourgeoisie, China's modern bankers and industrialists, the new generation of capitalists. And this working agreement found expression in the role of the Kuomintang. With the growth of Chinese participation in modern commerce and manufacturing, activities which in the nineteenth century had been virtually monopolized by foreign imperialists, the balance within the ruling circles naturally tended in their direction and away from the most reactionary agricultural landlords. T. V. Soong, the Harvard graduated twentieth-century businessman, became symbolic of the new capitalist class; his rise to positions of great importance in the government reflected the growing power of those he represented. H. H. Kung, one of the largest feudal landlords of North China, whose home was a veritable medieval fortress —serfs, armed guards, personal retinue, and all—for a time spanned the gap between the undeveloped back country and the modern treaty ports, centers of the new trend. Kung's political oscillations between reaction and progress, if charted, would be found to correspond to an extraordinary extent with the changing balance of forces between feudalism and capitalism in the government, the over-all trend being until the end of 1938 toward the latter. It was he, indeed, who in that year contributed $10,000 to the guerrilla forces in the north who then as now represented the most advanced social elements of the country. And it was Kung, likewise, who in the spring of this year replaced T. V. Soong as President of the Bank of China in a move which was widely heralded as marking a significant consolidation of reactionary power. For it was after the latter part of 1938 that the balance of forces in the government began to shift back to the feudal bureaucracy and Kung swung with them.

Why did this shift take place? Because the Japanese systematically and thoroughly destroyed the physical base of Chinese capitalism and the center of the Chinese government withdrew geographically, politically, and economically to the heart of the feudal hinterland. Practically every factory, large or small, was occupied or destroyed. The treaty ports, which in recent years had increasingly become the centers of an emerging indigenous capitalism, were one by one taken over. Tientsin, Tsingtao, Shanghai, Hankow, Canton in falling to enemy hands were lost to the economic and political structure of the Chinese government.

The new political base from which the government operated and support from which retained it in power was the feudal bureaucracy of old China. The relationship of forces in this reactionary economy has been ably set forth by the Chinese scholar Hsu Yung-ying, now associated with the Institute of Pacific Relations. Writing in the summer issue, 1943, of the magazine *Amerasia* Dr. Hsu said:

". . . the body economic of China has been traditionally dominated by landlords and bureaucrats, who live off the people, mainly the farmers, but have no moral obligation to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

participate in production. The bureaucracy itself, moreover, is merely a form and creature of landlordism. Since landlordism is too nakedly exposed to the discontent of the peasants, the bureaucracy lives upon collective land rent in the form of taxes and thus serves to cloak the ugly appearance of landlord parasitism. It constitutes a sort of communal landlordism, which is also enabled to mobilize greater political and military power for the suppression of mass discontent."

How does such a feudal bureaucracy function during the war? The same author tells us:

"When the mask of bureaucracy is torn off by modern knowledge and the social reform movement, it is quite natural for this social force which has dominated the nation for centuries to seek further cover. It is for this reason that such persistent efforts have been exerted to enlarge the government and semi-government personnel under the pretense of mobilizing the country's economic forces for defense and preparing the nation for socialism or state capitalism. Elaborate systems and plans of 'economic control,' 'price stabilization,' 'state industry,' 'industrial reconstruction,' and even a program for the development of 'democracy' in the local districts, have been instituted. These measures present a fine appearance to those who are uninitiated in the social and economic structure of China, and are accordingly applauded. On the whole, however, the net result has been deterioration of the country's economy and a progressive weakening in the striking power of the armies under the Central Command, while local and central institutions have become more complex and less democratic. The producing farmers, craftsmen, laborers, and agricultural and industrial employers, as well as those engaged in transport and trade, have to support the war and an expanding military, civil, and party bureaucracy in addition to the old-time gentry and landlords who have not been directly incorporated into the new regime."

That able characterization of the increasingly dominant forces in the Chungking government explains its inability to meet the economic, social, political, or military needs of the war against the Japanese aggressor. The requirements of the war are progress toward unity, toward democracy, the stimulation of modern enterprise, private and cooperative, land reform and the substitution of scientific for medieval methods of agricultural production. The derivatives of a feudal bureaucracy are the very opposite: hoarding, speculation, paternalism, the choking off of the very private initiative called for by the scarcity of production and the introduction of parasitic, inefficient and often corrupt state monopolies.

Official expression to the aspirations of the reactionaries has been given by no less a person than the President of China, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, in a volume entitled *China's Destiny*, which appeared under his authorship early in 1943. The most notable analysis of *China's Destiny* appeared in the January, 1944, issue of this magazine in the translation of a brilliant criticism published in Yenan by the Chinese Communist leader Chen Pai-ta.

The thesis of *China's Destiny* is a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

denial of internal democracy, a plea for a return to feudalism under the authoritarian dictatorship of the Kuomintang, a repudiation of international cooperation or contact on any basis whatsoever, a demand for complete isolation in a Chinese Dark Age. The very fact that it appeared under such distinguished patronage and was made compulsory reading in the nation's educational system in the midst of China's most desperate struggle for national existence tragically bespeaks the power of reaction in the Chungking government.

It was argued a year ago with some justification that the tone and content of Chiang Kai-shek's book reflected the long and deep bitterness of many Chinese over the inexcusable treatment they had received at the hands of their supposed allies, the United States and Great Britain. There had been the notorious period of appeasement of Japan, the almost non-existent aid to the brave Chinese defense, the unspeakable closing of the Burma supply route. Then had come Pearl Harbor and a joining in the war effort; but to many Chinese this had meant in the initial stage only the collapse of "western" defenses in the southwest Pacific and southeast Asia. To the world, indeed, this had meant the sorry spectacle of putrid colonialism in the hour of greatest crisis. There had been, too, the conspicuously second-class treatment of the Chinese in the early counsels of the United Nations. There was justification, surely, for bitterness and disappointment on the part of many Chinese.

Since the first publication of the book, much has happened to overcome Chinese resentment. There have taken place, most conspicuously, notable victories against the enemy, the historic exploits of American airmen at the service of the Chinese ground troops, the decisions of the Moscow and Cairo conferences. Not only the hope, but the fact of improved relations among the Allies was at hand. Under such circumstances, the publication early this year of a new edition of *China's Destiny* in which no significant changes in political outlook may be discerned is evidence that any charitable interpretation of the early edition was ill-founded.

The arch enemy of a feudal bureaucracy consists of all those elements in the economic, social, political and military life of China which are required to bring about a speedy victory over Japan. It is inherent in the nature of a backward landlord economy that it resists industrialization, land reform, new agricultural techniques, capitalist initiative, democratic political institutions, education and self-reliance among the troops, trade unionism, representative government, independent political parties, fraternal relations between soldiers and peasants, close relations with foreign allies. Its function is to turn history backward upon itself and in so doing to deny progress and victory. If the reactionary feudalists were successfully to consolidate their power it would be as if in the United States the Rankins, Bilboes, and Dieses, supported by the Hearsts, McCormicks and Patter-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sons, and allied with the Gerald L. K. Smiths, the Father Coughlins, and those now on trial for sedition in Washington, formed the decisive force in our government and military councils. That is how profoundly serious is the crisis in China.

Democracy in China

What I have described, the feudal bureaucracy of China, is not the whole of China by any means. It represents neither the needs nor aspirations of the common people, nor the wishes of the intellectuals, nor of the students. It does not conform with the policies advocated by a number of minority parties of which the Communist is much the largest. It cannot even be said to represent the views of a majority of the Kuomintang Party. The feudal bureaucracy is a small clique of parasitic politicians whose political roots lie in an anachronistic landlord-peasant economy. But the unfortunate and significant thing is that this clique at present has more influence in the government and upon its leader, Chiang Kai-shek, than any other group, that its influence has been steadily increasing since the winter of 1938-39, and that the implications, when not the direct purpose, of all its acts are to sabotage the nation, the war, and the coalition of Allied powers.

Can the stranglehold of this clique be broken? Can the trend be reversed? The answers to these questions are to be found among those who are actively engaged in the struggle against the Japanese enemy. The Communists are only one element among the Chinese patriots; but they are the largest, best organized, and most active in the field of battle. We shall gain some estimate of those forces opposing the dominance of the feudal bureaucracy if we examine the policies of those regions controlled or led by the Communists.

In June of this year Mao Tse-tung, chairman of the Communist Party of China, reiterated the policy which had dominated the Communists since the earliest period of the war. The Communist Party, he said, will struggle for the overthrow of Japanese imperialism and for the building of "an independent democratic China." "China has defects—very serious defects. The result has been that China lacks democracy. The Chinese people need democracy, because only democracy can give strength to the Chinese war of resistance, can put the internal and external relations of China on the right track, and can give victory to our war of resistance. Democracy can enable us to build a good country now and after the war. Only when there is democracy can China's unity continue after the war." *

The areas in which Communist leadership prevails embrace more than a million square miles, with a population of 86,000,000 north of the Lunghai railway reaching well into Inner Mongolia on the north and from the Yellow Sea and the Gulf of Chihli on the east westward to the Yellow River. Much of this territory is under nominal Japanese occupation; but in point of fact the enemy controls only the main cities

* United Press dispatch, Yenan, China, June 12.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and towns and enjoys a precarious hold upon the major lines of communication. From some fifteen bases in this region the Eighth Route Army, guerrilla detachments, local militia and village self-defense units have during the war engaged more than 40 per cent of all the Japanese forces in China and accounted for enemy casualties in men and supplies out of all proportion to their relative strength in the scheme of Chinese defense.

Under natural conditions worse than those facing "Kuomintang China" and with all the obstacles of a primitive agricultural economy and landlordism a genuine Chinese democracy is being forged in the midst of war and for the express purpose of winning the war. An admirable and up-to-date report of this work has been made available in this country and in Great Britain by Michael Lindsay, son of the Master of Balliol College, Oxford, and a former teacher at Yenching University, who on the day of Pearl Harbor escaped to the guerrilla areas where he has stayed ever since. In this country his complete report, which deserves careful study, appeared in the March 31 and April 14 issues of *Amerasia*. Other fragmentary accounts of "Democratic China" have been given by other foreigners who have passed through these centers of resistance during the war, and a limited amount of Chinese material from Yenan has found its way through the Kuomintang censorship. Mr. T. A. Bisson, writing in the *Far Eastern Survey* of July 14, 1943, before Michael Lindsay's comprehensive report appeared, has nevertheless ably summarized the conclusions which any honest observer would reach. What he has to say is currently being supported by the dispatches appearing in the *New York Times*, the *New York Herald Tribune*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, and other newspapers from the first foreign correspondents who have been permitted to visit the Border Region since the beginning of the war. Mr. Bisson writes:

"The key to the successful mobilization of the war potential of so-called Communist China lies in the extent to which its leaders have thrown off the feudal incubus which has weighed China down for centuries. No single measure can be pointed to as the open sesame which has increasingly achieved this objective. Economic reforms have been intertwined with political reforms, the one supporting the other. Basic to the whole program has been the land reform which has freed the peasant—the primary producer in these areas, and, indeed, over most of China—from the crushing weight of rent, taxes and usurious interest charges as levied by a feudal economy.

"But the ingenuity of this reform, without which it would hardly be made to work, is that the newly introduced procedures of local democracy serve as the final sanction. The landlord and entrepreneur are not excluded from this process, but neither are they permitted to dominate it. Tax assessment committees, for example, are controlled by a majority of *local* members and exercise a strictly *local* jurisdiction. Farmers know well what their neighbors own.

"Over wide areas of this new

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

China, elected councils — village, town and district—and elected executive officials have completely supplanted the old autocratic system of feudal agrarian China. These councils and officials are either unpaid or receive mere pittances which leave them no better off economically than their fellow citizens.

"It is this democratic process, finally, which permits a large measure of free competition to operate over the whole of the economy. Bureaucratic price controls are not attempted. They are as unnecessary in this society as they would be in a New England town meeting. No landlord or merchant, with the watchful eyes of his neighbors upon him, can engage in hoarding or speculation. Within limits set mainly by local democratic checks, the individual landlord or entrepreneur is free, and is even encouraged, to expand his operations, and many are doing so.

"By no stretch of imagination can this be termed Communism; it is, in fact, the essence of bourgeois democracy, applied mainly to agrarian conditions. The leaders in Yenan see in this program more than the answer to China's immediate problem of efficiently mobilizing her resources for the war against Japan. They see in it also the means of throwing off China's feudal shackles, the transition to modern nationhood."

Yet this is the China which is cut off from the rest of the nation by an armed blockade. These are the troops who have not received a gun or a bullet, a bandage or a pill from their government for four years. These are the millions of brave Chinese whom a handful of vicious bureaucrats in Chungking try to castigate. Only a short time ago one of the most responsible spokesmen for the Chungking reactionaries as well as a prominent Kuomintang general accused these heroes of the Border Region of sabotaging the war.

Kuomintang-Communist Relations

It is plain that it is not communism that is being blockaded. Communism does not exist in North China today. It is not brought forward as an immediate program by any organized group. Michael Lindsay, himself not a Communist, refers briefly to Mao Tse-tung's *New Democracy*. Unfortunately the volume has not yet penetrated through unfriendly Chinese censors; but the following sentences from Mr. Lindsay's report indicate the Communist Party's political and economic perspective. Mao's book, writes Mr. Lindsay, "recognizes that under present Chinese conditions a communist system would be unworkable and looks forward to a long period of development under capitalist democratic institutions with only a certain amount of government control and participation in key industries. This program conforms to the facts of the situation."

If it is neither communism nor the specter of communism which is being blockaded, what practices and institutions of the guerrilla bases are so much feared in Chungking? They are nothing more nor less than democracy. For democracy is the enemy of a feudal bureaucracy and therefore cannot be tolerated by it. But is it an accident that democracy is also the one way in which China can achieve unity, nationhood, and victory?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For some time it has been hoped that at least formal progress would be announced in the resolution of the difficulties between Chungking and Yenan. Since the middle of May parleys have been going on in Chungking between representatives of the Kuomintang, including Chiang Kai-shek himself, and Lin Tsu-han, chairman of the Border Region government. These conversations have been based upon a preliminary agreement negotiated in Sian. As late as July 1, however, Chou En-lai told American correspondents in Yenan that "there still is considerable distance between the Government's proposals and our suggestions. The Central Committee of our party is considering its reply to these proposals, hoping that a rational solution will be found. By a rational solution is meant one beneficial to unity in the war of resistance and to the promotion of democracy, and under this principle, our party is glad to conduct any discussion." Late in July the Chinese Minister of Information, Liang Han-chao, announced in Chungking that the Communists' suggestions had been rejected.

The proposals made to the government by Lin Tsu-han were reported in the July issue of *Amerasia* as follows: first, that the regular Communist forces should be incorporated into the Chinese national army and granted equal treatment as regards equipment, pay, and supplies; second, that political prisoners should be released and the blockade against the guerrilla areas lifted; third, that democratic reforms should be instituted by the Chungking government, including freedom of speech and assembly, and the granting of legal status to all political parties.

As reported by the Associated Press from Chungking, Chiang Kai-shek's counter-proposals on behalf of the government stipulated that the government did not object to granting legal status to the Communist Party; that the government agreed to the enlargement of the Eighteenth Group (Eighth Route) Army on the understanding that they would be subject to orders from Chungking; that the Communist area in northern Shensi should be placed under direct administration of the Executive Yuan; that taxation and currency in the Communist area no longer be independent of the national system; and that the Kuomintang, General Chiang's own Nationalist Party, would run the government for the duration of the war, but that after the war there would be absolute equality among parties and free participation in the government.

It is evident that these government counter-proposals are unacceptable. If agreed to, they would place the Kuomintang bureaucracy in a position to destroy the Communist Party and its armies and to obliterate the democratic institutions developed in North China. Under such circumstances the promise of equality among political parties *after* the war is worthless. In this connection it should be especially noted that one of the government demands is to place the area of northern Shensi under its direct administration, a point which loses

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its subtlety when it is recalled that the Communist capital, Yenan, is situated in that particular region. There can be no reconciliation until the Kuomintang recognizes *during* the war the democratic institutions essential to winning the war and unifying the nation for the trying post-war period of reconstruction, rehabilitation and leadership among the United Nations.

Democratic Forces in Kuomintang China

While the Chungking bureaucracy has diligently sought to prevent any news from North China guerrilla bases reaching the foreign world and has simultaneously issued its own falsehoods regarding the accomplishments of the Communists and guerrillas, enough information is available, as suggested above, to give us a balanced picture. It would, however, be a distortion of the actual situation to picture the border regions as the only champions of democracy and genuine anti-fascism in China.

The Chinese Communist Party is certainly the most powerfully organized group now actively engaged in spreading and deepening Chinese democracy and spurring the war effort. But it is not alone in this role. Throughout "Kuomintang China" there are forces striving to overthrow the clique of Chungking reactionaries so that progress can be made toward democratizing the war effort and speeding victory.

The suppression of democratic rights has been so drastic that these struggles in "Kuomintang China" have not achieved the success of those carried on in North China. They nevertheless constitute a very important part of the political potential of the country; for it is these democratic groups who in cooperation with the Communist Party will eventually liberate the nation from the stranglehold of reaction. It is therefore important that we should note them.

There is a common but mistaken notion that there are only two political groups in China, the Kuomintang and the Communists. From this has derived the belief that the Kuomintang's insistence on one-party rule was directed solely against the challenge of the Communists. The ruling group in the Kuomintang has nurtured that belief. On that false premise it has been possible for the reactionaries to spread the lie, with some effect, that the internal struggle of the nation was simply one between the government and the Reds.

The real struggle in China is not between the Kuomintang and the Communists. It is a struggle between a small, but momentarily dominant, pro-feudalist clique within the Kuomintang, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the great mass of Chinese people, including very large sections of the Kuomintang membership itself and, of course, the Communists. The reason the reactionary clique is able to retain power against such apparently overwhelming opposition is that in the democratic camp only the Communists have sufficient strength and organizatoin and enjoy a geographical position that permits them to retain an organizational integrity.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Kuomintang China the opposition to reaction is scattered, unorganized, and often confused.

Within the Kuomintang, opposition to the bureaucracy has in recent months been boldly expressed by Sun Fo, a high official of the government and son of the revered Father of the Chinese Revolution, Dr. Sun Yat-sen. He has spoken strongly in favor of close and friendly relations with the Soviet Union, a policy which cannot be advanced without concurrently releasing the forces of democracy within China, and he has spoken with equal fervor against internal reaction. It is not necessary to give exaggerated weight to Sun Fo's own role as a liberal leader to see the significance of his position.

One of the truly heroic figures of China, Madame Sun Yat-sen, widow of the Father of the Revolution, speaks from a non-partisan point of view calling for unity and democracy to win the war. That she speaks as openly as she does indicates the strength of those for whom she speaks. The feudalist reaction dares not eliminate her from the political scene. Last January in a message addressed to American workers, Madame Sun had this to say:

"The Chinese people are strong in defense of their own soil as proved by their resistance through seven years. But reaction and fascism are strong also. This is proved by the betrayal of Wang Ching-wei and of many army generals, by the increased ease with which the Japanese can operate in different parts of our country, by the diversion of part of our national army to the task of blockading and 'guarding' the guerrilla areas, by the fact that some still hold private profit above the national interest, by the oppression of the peasantry, and by the absence of a true labor movement in most of our territory." *

In addition to such individual leaders—and there are many others—there exist within Kuomintang China a number of minor political parties of conservatives, liberals, and intellectuals united on the issue of democracy and national unity for the war. During the early months of 1939, when reaction was again setting in after a period of developing national unity, Liang Shu-ming, Rural Reconstructionist leader and member of the People's Political Council at Chungking, set about to bring together for a joint effort the several small political groups which independently were ineffective. By the close of the year the United National Construction League, later known as the Federation of Chinese Democratic Parties, was formed around the Young China Party, the National Salvation Association, the National Socialist Party, the "Third Party," the Rural Reconstructionists, and the Vocational Education Group.

In March of 1940 the League intervened with the government on the occasion of an armed clash between Central Army and Eighth Route Army troops. In January, 1941, after the New Fourth Army Incident, in which government troops under virtually fascist orders

* Chungking, Dec. 15, 1943, by air mail, distributed by *Allied Labor News*, January 27, 1944.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attacked and destroyed a section of the Communist-led forces in Central China, the League demanded that all such attacks be stopped, that the culprits of the Incident be punished, prisoners released, and compensation paid, that the blockade of the Northwest be lifted, that pro-Japanese officials be arrested, and that the one-party dictatorship be abolished. Their efforts at reconciling the internal conflict failed.

The Federation, as it was now called, issued a declaration of principles in the autumn of 1941 in which two points were declared to be basic: political power must be made truly democratic, and the army must be made truly national. The policy of the Kuomintang was to prevent all information respecting this declaration and the work of the Federation from being distributed and to harass its leaders, most of whom were self-exiled in Hongkong. By the time of Pearl Harbor the Federation had nevertheless gained widespread prestige in and out of China. Today its leaders and component groups constitute a part of the democratic potential within Kuomintang China.

Aid to Those Who Actually Fight

The question which faces Americans and China's other allies, the question with which the Chinese people are struggling in their everyday life, is how this democratic potential spread throughout the length and breadth of China can be organized and strengthened for victory over the minority forces of disunity and defeat. The job can and will be done mainly by the Chinese people themselves. It cannot be done just from the outside. But the policies adopted by China's allies in the course of fighting a war of coalition will modify China's future either favorably or unfavorably. The policies pursued by the allied nations and by the United States in particular may even be decisive in turning the balance toward or away from democracy and victory.

The overmastering factor in the Chinese scene is, of course, the defeat of the Japanese invader. And it is here that the United States and Great Britain, allied in the European phase of the war with the Soviet Union and with China in the Far East, are making and will complete their greatest contribution to China.

The problem remains whether China will be able to play a positive role in bringing Japan to an early defeat, whether she will emerge from battle a scarred but united nation ready to play a leading role in establishing world security. In short, will the defeat of Japan be quick and decisive, or will it be of interminable length and uncertain outcome? In the solution of this problem China's allies, and particularly the United States, can, and in their own interests must, also play a part. How?

The guiding principles of our war policy can be simply expressed: we must give material aid to those who are actively engaged or who wish to be actively engaged in destroying the enemy, and we must politically influence the Chinese government to rid itself of treacherous elements

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and put an end to the scandalous situation which has its most notorious expression in the blockade of the northern guerrilla areas. If followed courageously and consistently, a policy guided by that principle will render immeasurable aid to all Chinese patriots.

In this connection let me quote a paragraph from Michael Lindsay's report on the guerrilla bases in North China, for it illustrates in specific terms what can and should be done:

"If the Chinese had better supplies of ammunition," he writes, "the whole situation in North China would be changed. A few light machine guns or even extensive rifle fire could make the communication lines in the mountains impassable except by large forces, and the new motor roads on the plain with a deep blockade ditch on either side would be death traps for any small Japanese forces if the Chinese could use cross fire from machine guns. The usual small garrisons would be practically useless if their patrols and raiding parties, which usually consist of only 15 to 20 men, could be subjected to continual sniping by the Chinese troops or the local village militiamen. The usual Japanese fort is a tower two or three stories high which can resist rifle fire but which would be useless against any form of artillery. If, therefore, the Chinese forces had a good supply of cartridges and a number of light mountain guns, the Japanese would lose all that they have managed to gain in North China, and their control would again be restricted to the main railway lines which would be subject to frequent interruption. . . ."

Or, take an example from the extreme other end of China. In the area between Hongkong and Canton there exists an organization known as the Kwangtung People's Anti-Japanese Guerrilla Corps, whose achievements since the fall of Canton in 1938, though little known, deserve the widest recognition. Although for over two years the Japanese have controlled both ends of the Canton-Kowloon (the Hongkong terminal) Railway they have not been able to run a single through train. In the spring of 1940 Central Government troops were sent against these guerrillas, and again in the spring of 1942 Chungking organized two divisions for a punitive campaign against them; but a corps that now numbers over ten thousand still harasses the enemy in that strategic sector. When it is recalled that the declared strategy of Admiral Nimitz's forces is to establish a beachhead on the southeast coast of China in order to open an ocean supply route to the interior, the importance of strengthening such fighters as the Kwangtung guerrillas already operating in that sector becomes apparent.

There are many other cases of fighting strength remaining in China. All suffer from lack of supplies, most are sabotaged by the reactionary clique in Chungking, and most have no direct contact with China's allies. Another such force, with a long record of magnificent military achievement, is the New Fourth Army which operated in Central China until evicted by Chinese traitors but which has now re-emerged in greater strength in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kiangsu, Anhwei, Honan, and Hupeh. There are, moreover, many units of the regular army, such as the large body of troops now engaged in successful fighting against the enemy on the Salween River front in China's southwest, which deserve high priority in receiving foreign aid when lend-lease materials really begin to flow.

The policy of rendering material aid to China's fighting forces must be accompanied by consistent and persistent political pressure designed to liberate the nation's maximum war effort. Americans and Britons, no more than Chinese, can no longer suffer the machinations of the feudal bureaucratic clique which blocks the development of democracy and stands in the way of victory.

To sum up this aspect of our analysis, medical aid, liaison, technical aid, at first small arms and ammunition, and later the materials for large-scale offensives—these are the ways in which those groups in China now actively engaged in fighting the enemy can be given assistance. Every step that is taken to strengthen them will not only advance the date of victory over the Japanese but it will also serve to weight the internal Chinese balance in favor of the democratic elements. In this connection it is well to pay heed to the words of Earl Browder in *Teheran—Our Path in War and Peace:*

"If we would begin to apply the principles of the Teheran concord to the Far East, as eventually we must, we would save the lives of untold numbers of American boys and bring victory much quicker. We would establish American military and consular representation in the China Northwest Autonomous Border Region; we would insure that a share of American lend-lease aid, proportionate to their share of the fighting, reached those armies; we would urge, in the spirit of Teheran and the Atlantic Charter, the Chungking regime to respond to the oft-repeated appeals that have come from the Chinese Communist leaders for national unity and the beginnings of a democratic regime.

"The Teheran concord is already in the process of solving the many stubborn problems of Europe which are, in essence, of the same nature as the problem of China."

The Promise of the Four-Power Leadership

The promise of Teheran, of Moscow, of Cairo cannot be fulfilled unless the United States and Great Britain succeed in aiding China to rid herself of the incubus of feudalism and develop national strength under the stimulant of democracy. For in order to stabilize the peace, in order to make good the military victory that will be won, it is necessary that the leadership of the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China be a reality. Not that there is any magic quality in the number four nor that there is a sentimental value in boosting China to a position of artificial leadership. The issue is an entirely practical one. The security of the Far East, as well as a speedy and decisive victory, demands a strong, democratic Chinese nation. It is not a matter of choice, it is one of necessity.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What is called for today is the exact reverse of the disastrous imperialist policy of the pre-war period. That was a policy which not only subjugated China but played a substantial role in strengthening Japanese fascism. The utterly shameful spectacle of the arming of Japan by the United States and Great Britain from 1931 to almost the day of Pearl Harbor was the logical, if disgusting, climax of decades of mistaken policy.

Signal steps have been taken in making amends for past errors respecting China. The Cairo and Moscow conferences gave formal recognition to China's leadership. The renunciation of extraterritorial rights and the repeal of discriminatory immigration laws gave tangible recognition to the principle of equality. A further step in recognizing China's importance was the recent official visit of Vice President Wallace who directly represented President Roosevelt. In a joint statement issued by him and by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek at the conclusion of the visit these significant words appeared: "Cognizance was taken of the cornerstone position of China in Asia and of the importance of China in any structure for peace in the Pacific area."

"Enduring peace in the Pacific," the statement said, "will depend upon: (1) effective permanent demilitarization of Japan; (2) understanding friendship and collaboration between and among all United Nations willing to share in the responsibilities of postwar international order; and (3) recognition of the fundamental right of presently dependent Asiatic peoples to self-government, and the early adoption of measures in the political, economic and social fields to prepare those dependent peoples for self-government within a specified practical time limit."

Emphasis is placed here and elsewhere in the joint declaration upon the importance of "mutual understanding" between China and the Soviet Union, and during his trip the Vice President emphasized that the U.S.S.R. and China were friendly neighbors. These statements have done much to counteract the vicious propaganda of those Soviet-baiters who claim in the same breath that the Soviet Union has "forsaken" China and that it is planning the forcible sovietization of that country.

Through the historic agreements of Moscow, Teheran, and Cairo we have at hand the framework of the future organization of the world. China's place in that organization has been given formal recognition. It remains to make it a functioning reality. To secure their own stake in regional and world security, the Allied nations, particularly the United States, Great Britain and the Dominions, must see to it that China is enabled to assume this leadership. To defeat Japan quickly and unconditionally we must ally ourselves with and support the vast majority of the Chinese people in their struggle against the feudal bureaucratic clique under which their war effort is being stifled. China must be geared for victory and for world security.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A COMPANY UNION OF NATIONS?

A REVIEW OF WALTER LIPPMANN'S *U. S. WAR AIMS* *

BY HANS BERGER

THE idea of Teheran is that the victorious termination of the war and the assurance of peace for an extended period depend on the close post-war cooperation among the great powers of the anti-Hitler coalition, the United States, the Soviet Union and England. This concept is so simple and clear that it is obvious to the common man and to common sense. If this conception remains the guide also in the most complicated situations, then the evil of a new war will be avoided. After this war the United States, the Soviet Union and England will be the mightiest military and economic powers of the world. Collective security after the war means therefore, above all, the readiness of these three powers, through mutual understanding, to prevent any conflict from developing into a war and to nip in the bud any intended aggression. Any post-war world organization which is not constructed on this fundamental necessity is hopelessly doomed to failure. In his book *Teheran* Earl Browder has shown with indefeasible dialectic the consequences of an anti-Teheran policy.

The fact that the three great powers must constitute the core of every world organization does not at all mean that the smaller nations will be oppressed. On the contrary, as the history of modern imperialism shows, the small nations have always been the victims of imperialist contradictions and war. All too often they have been mere pawns on the chessboard of imperialist rivalries. If these rivalries are eliminated or reduced to a minimum, then there will be a period of security for the medium and the small nations, of real independence, of genuine sovereignty. For the medium and small nations the fact that the Big Three must constitute the core of every effective post-war world organization will be only an affirmation that they cannot bear the material and military responsibility for collective security. If, therefore, the medium and small nations cannot constitute the core of a new world organization, it is not because they are "better" or "worse" than the Big Three —the character of a nation has nothing to do with its size—but only because they are too weak to prevent aggressors from aggression.

But, despite this, the voices of the smaller and less powerful states in the council of the nations will be

* *U. S. War Aims*, by Walter Lippmann. Little, Brown, 1944. $1.50.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of great importance. Their opinions, their development, their achievements will always play an important role in the future development of the world. This will be the more so when their security and sovereignty will be guaranteed and they will be freed from the necessity of playing balance-of-power politics or of being the tool of stronger imperialist interests, as was their unhappy fate, not only before the First World War, but especially after the defeat of German imperialism in the years following 1918.

In his book of a year ago, *U.S. Foreign Policy: Shield of the Republic*, Walter Lippmann very successfully proved the bankruptcy of isolationism as a national policy. Without subscribing in toto to his interpretation of American history, one could readily see that his conclusion as to the necessity for every sound American policy to have done with isolationism once and for all was a service to the country. In that book Lippmann came to the practical conclusion that the "*nuclear alliance of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China*" must be the basis of the future foreign policy of the United States. Apparently the opinion he held then made Lippmann a supporter of Wendell Willkie.

He who hoped to find in Lippmann's newest book, *U.S. War Aims*, an elaboration of this principle will be disappointed as he was disappointed that Willkie was defeated in the Republican Party and the policies of the Hoover-Taft-Vandenberg combination were victorious. Lippmann has turned his back on the principle of collective security and its implementation through the nuclear alliance of the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union and China. Of course, the style and manner of argumentation remain Lippmannesque, but the spirit of the new book is the collective mentality of those circles represented by Hoover, Taft and Vandenberg. To read it is to understand why this erstwhile champion of Willkie has turned into the troubadour of a Dewey.

Lippmann, of course, sees the possibility of a long peace ahead. He states:

"We shall not be deceiving ourselves when we believe that a great and long peace is within our reach, and that we face an opportunity unlike any that has presented itself for centuries." (p. 5.)

The virtue of seeing peace possible for a long time ahead is truly questionable if the only means to achieve this goal is destroyed, as Lippmann sets out to destroy it. He does so by offering in place of collective security through the "nuclear alliance" of the big powers an ersatz system of monstrous balance-of-power politics through the organization of "orbits."

* * *

Lippmann divides the world into four communities or orbits. The first is the Atlantic Community. It consists of forty-two states: U.S.A., United Kingdom, France, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ireland, Guatemala,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Liberia, Luxemburg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Commonwealth of the Philippines, Portugal, Salvador, Union of South Africa, Spain, Uruguay, Venezuela. Aside from these states, Sweden, Italy, Greece and Switzerland would also belong to the Atlantic Community.

Lippmann calculates the population of these forty-two states at 522,000,000. But these figures do not include the inhabitants of the colonies of these countries. In this Atlantic Community there are all the European states with colonial possessions: England, France, Belgium, Holland, Portugal, Spain, Italy. Why Lippmann leaves out the colonial populations is not quite clear, although he may have in mind that sooner or later they will become independent nations: "Colonial policy can no longer be the sole prerogative of the imperial states, and will have to be set by consultation and agreement" (p. 35).

But since this may not be the case on the day after victory, all these colonies with their populations will belong to the Atlantic Community for the time being. For should Lippmann set up the Atlantic Community only *after* "consultation and agreement" in regard to the fate of the colonies with Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, etc., it would mean not a little delay until this Atlantic Community could be organized and his geopolitical dream realized. And Mr. Lippmann gives no indication of being willing to wait.

The second community is the "Russian orbit": "The boundaries of the Russian orbit are not clearly defined. But it certainly extends from Prague to Vladivostok, from Eastern Europe to the shores of Eastern Asia and its heart is the Soviet Union." (p. 83.) Therefore, included in this orbit are apparently: Poland, Finland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Austria, and Turkey. Lippmann does not specify all these countries as belonging to the Russian orbit. But they are not included in the list of states of the Atlantic Community and, since he divides Europe into an Atlantic Community and a Russian orbit, they must belong inferentially to the Russian orbit. If Lippmann does not enumerate all these states as explicitly as he does the states of the Atlantic Community, it is perhaps because he is not yet sure whether Turkey, Austria, Yugoslavia, etc., could not by invocation to the goddess Geopolitics be granted to his Atlantic Community.

The third community (à la Caesar of old, Lippmann does his dividing into three parts), is the Chinese orbit.* If China is stabilized it will become the heart of the smaller states like Indo-China, Burma, Thailand and the Malay States. Lippmann says nothing about Korea. In reference to the relation between China and the Soviet Union he declares: "China and the Soviet Union will have to come to terms along their great Asiatic frontier." (p. 93.)

In addition to the stated orbits,

* Lippmann reserves the term "community" only for the Atlantic Community.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there is also something, very much in the dark, which Lippmann calls "emergent Asia." He sees the emergence of an independent India and sovereign Moslem states, and refers to the danger to peace that might arise from the stirring of the Asiatic peoples, if the members of the Atlantic Community acted independently of one another in relation to China, the Middle East, India, Burma, the Malay States and the East Indies. Likewise, he sees a danger to peace in case the Soviet Union and the Atlantic nations become rivals and potential enemies in relation to China, India, and the Middle East.

The basis for the security of the individual states lies, according to Lippmann, in the communities or orbits. War between the members of a community *should be absolutely excluded* through common measures and agreements. No country of one community should have the right to make agreements, excluding other powers of the community, with any country of another community. Within an orbit or community peace is to be guaranteed through regional security. The guarantee of peace between the communities, however, will depend on the complete non-interference of the nations of one community in the affairs of the nations of the others. We shall see later that Lippmann has two standards of non-interference, adjustable to his ideas of the fitness of things.

Lippmann sees the experiences with German and Japanese imperialism as constituting the grounds for the organization of the Atlantic Community and of the Russian orbit. The organization of the former, consisting of forty-two nations, is intended to prevent the United States from ever again finding itself in so dangerous a situation as in 1941-42, when it saw itself standing alone against the power of German and Japanese imperialism, victorious in Europe, Africa and Asia.

The organization of a Russian orbit is intended to guarantee security to the Soviet Union against a new German attack.

* * *

If one analyzes Lippmann's Atlantic Community it becomes clear at once that the main reason for the formation of the Atlantic Community *cannot* be the danger of a new aggression by Germany. For the power which has had the greatest share in the defeat of German fascism, the Soviet Union, is not included in this Community. If Lippmann wanted to create a new world organization which was directed against a new German aggression it would be impossible to do so *without making an alliance with the Soviet Union as the keystone.* That becomes even clearer if one views the forty-two states that are supposed to guarantee exclusively the security of the United States against a new German aggression. A large number of these nations are of *at least as great* importance to the security of the Soviet Union, as of the United States, against a new aggression by Germany. It is not comprehensible why the security of France, England, the Scandinavian countries against a new German

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aggression should be of any less significance to the Soviet Union than to the United States. From the standpoint of building up security against a new German aggression the Soviet Union has surely the same interest as the United States in firm agreements with a large number of nations which Lippmann appropriates exclusively for the Atlantic Community.

And what about the interests of the European states among these forty-two — for instance, France, England, Holland, the Scandinavian countries? From the viewpoint of security against a new German aggression their interests are not sufficiently protected by far through their membership in the Atlantic Community. The interests of these countries lie in the prevention of a new German aggression. They do not want to experience again what they have experienced during the past five years. They do not want to find themselves again in a situation where they have had to wait for years to be liberated. And what is more reasonable than that they should enter also—*and in time*—into especially close relations with that power which has its tested and mighty armies on the borders of Germany, the Soviet Union, the power which has proved itself a bulwark of the freedom of the peoples?

From this understandable point of view it follows that the interest of a large number of nations in the closest relations with the strongest military power of Europe cannot be any less than in the closest relations with the United States and England. An American realist cannot attempt to organize all these nations exclusively in an Anglo-American Community. Such an attempt would doubtless come into sharpest conflict with the interests of all nations which have been attacked or threatened by German imperialism and have to live on as neighbors of Germany. Such a policy is in sharpest contradiction to the policies enunciated by the responsible statesmen of the United Nations.

Doubtless the United States, as well as the Soviet Union and England — and Lippmann emphasizes these ideas quite correctly—view certain territories as the most immediate security zones: Panama, Ireland, the Belgian and French coasts, eastern Europe. But besides these there are a large number of territories in which both the Big Three and the peoples inhabiting them have exactly the same common interest in adopting jointly all necessary measures against a new aggression by Germany. The Atlantic Community is therefore not an organization which offers the nations the maximum security against a new German aggression, but constitutes, through exclusion of the Soviet Union, *a blow against the security of the European nations* and, therefore, in the last analysis, also a blow against the security of the United States. For the security of the United States, against a new German aggression in Europe with its dangerous consequences for the American continent, is best served through a firm alliance with the greatest European military power, the Soviet Union, and with the greatest European sea power, Eng-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

land. Lippmann himself admits this when he writes: "At enormous cost and danger Germany has been stopped from winning this war by the formation of the Alliance which, if it had existed before, could have prevented the war." (p. 115.) Why does he act then as though oblivious of the fact that the leading and decisive powers of this alliance during this war are not just any collection of nations, not the "Atlantic Community," but the U.S.A., the Soviet Union and Great Britain?

* * *

The horns of the dilemma spike him when it comes to the question of Germany.

To what orbit should Germany belong after the war? Lippmann declares quite correctly that "our primary war aim must be unalterable: it must be to make it as impossible for Germany to hold the balance of power in Europe as for Japan to hold it in Eastern Asia." (p. 177.) Lippmann also foresees correctly that the defeated German imperialists will attempt to play the western powers against the Soviet Union and vice versa, and warns against this trap. But what is going to become finally of a disarmed, democratic Germany? Such a Germany, Lippmann thinks, must finally be included in the Atlantic Community. And why in the Atlantic Community? "It will be safer for all of Europe and also for Russia," he answers, "if Germany becomes dependent upon maritime commerce." Lippmann himself feels that his proposal for the incorporation of Germany in the Atlantic Community is somewhat provocative. For he says:

"This conclusion will at first be unpalatable to the Western countries which would have to receive Germany into their trading community; it well may be highly suspect to the Russians on the ground that it extends the political influence of the Western states to the very frontiers of their strategic neighborhood. Yet these first reactions must be weighed against the alternatives.

"The permanent isolation of Germany is not a solution of the German problem. The attempt to isolate Germany will surely fail if it is extended beyond the time when her victims, and the Germans who now oppress them, are still in active life. The peoples of the world will not spend many long years supervising Germany in a reform school. Eventually Germany must have a recognized place of her own in the scheme of things. The real alternatives are a place in the Atlantic Community or in the Russian orbit." (p. 122.)

Lippmann dismisses lightly the question as to whether there will not be countries in Europe that will tire of being watchful of Germany, as for example the Soviet Union. As far as he is concerned, Germany is to be included in the Atlantic Community, outside the realm where the Soviet Union has something to say. And in order to prove that Germany cannot come into the Russian orbit he becomes slightly childish. His argument reads:

"But in the Russian orbit there is no place for Germany which is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

safe and tolerable for the Eastern States or for the Western. A Germany integrated with Russia would be a dangerous and menacing internal enemy of the Soviet Union. The very essence of Pan-Germanism, which is German infiltration and domination to the East, would remain in the form of a subversive movement in the Russian orbit. Moreover, a Germany facing East would be a crushing weight upon the political and economic life of the border nations from Poland to the Danubian countries and the Balkans." (p. 123.)

Lippmann performs here a very ordinary trick. The Germany that will be brought into the Atlantic Community is a gentle lamb, it has naturally discarded all its traditions of winning the western powers for an anti-Bolshevist crusade against the Soviet Union. It apparently never had and never will have imperialist designs against the western powers and the other nations incorporated in the Atlantic Community ("The very essence of Pan-Germanism . . . is domination to the East.") For the western powers and the other nations of the Atlantic Community Germany suddenly is no danger. (The Chamberlain thesis newly decked out!) (One can even hear Germany together with Walter Lippmann demanding of the Soviet Union "really true Democracy.") The same defeated Germany, however, becomes "dangerous and menacing" for the Soviet Union when the question of the "Russian orbit" is raised. Then Lippmann places himself protectively before the Soviet Union, changes the wolf into a lamb and invites it into the Atlantic Community for a little "trading."

But Lippmann who, of course, wants to be considered a serious politician quickly dismisses the childishness and comes to the real grounds for the necessity of incorporating Germany into the Atlantic Community:

"And as the inclusion of Germany within the Russian orbit would bring it to the shores of the Atlantic, this solution would be intolerable for the Western world." (Emphasis mine—H.B.)

For the Soviet Union, of course, it just has to be quite tolerable that, through the incorporation of Germany in the Atlantic Community, the power of the Atlantic Community will be extended to the "strategic borders of the Soviet Union!"

From the manner in which Lippmann handles the future position of Germany in Europe it becomes still clearer to everyone that the Atlantic Community is not in the first instance a system of collective security against a new German aggression.

Lippmann talks about the necessity of maritime trade for a future Germany. That means, of course, trade more or less under control of the United States. But the control of German trade means control of German economy and finance. Can any serious political commentator discuss the future of Germany's trade and finance without mentioning the problem of reparations, especially to the Soviet Union and the other devastated countries? Can any serious man doubt that the whole problem of German reparations will

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be a very important factor in the shaping of the economy, finance and trade of Germany for years to come? But Lippmann says not a word about German reparations. He excludes the Soviet Union from any kind of control over Germany, puts Germany unilaterally under the control of the western powers and seriously proposes to the Soviet Union that it be satisfied with having contributed its great share to the defeat of Germany and that it leave all the rest to his "Atlantic Community." If a policy of provocation against an ally is realism, then Walter Lippmann is indeed an eminent realist. Lippmann does not take into consideration that the Soviet Union and many European nations have had all too costly experience with such exclusive "community" control of Germany. And we Americans are in a world war as a result of such "control." No, Mr. Lippmann, the old saying of Heraclitus still holds: "You cannot step into the same river twice."

Lippmann can simply not solve the question of the problem of the future of Germany in any other way. For since his starting point is not the policy of Teheran, but rather the organization of blocs, *there is no possibility of common control of Germany by the great powers, but only the inclusion of Germany in a new war-breeding bloc!*

Lippmann treads on dangerous ground because he has organized his Atlantic Community not as a guarantee against a new German aggression *but against the Soviet Union.* Therefore he wants to bring into the Atlantic Community everything at all possible, and naturally, in the first place, Germany. Lippmann is not organizing the cordon sanitaire of 1918-1919. He knows that that is not possible now. Therefore he recognizes the "Russian orbit." But his Atlantic Community is basically nothing but a "dignified" *world cordon sanitaire.* It includes in reality 80-90 per cent of the world under the leadership of the United States and England—England playing the role of the junior partner: a) the major part of Europe and all colonies; b) China and the small Asiatic powers, under the economic and financial leadership of the U.S.A.; c) emergent Asia under the leadership of the U.S.A. and England.

War will be excluded only within the orbits. But there will be "no world order of peace." There will be big blocs hoping for a happy-go-lucky pragmatist way out. Lippmann states:

"Quite evidently the crucial question of how long and how confident can be the peace after this war will be determined by the maintenance of the substance of the alliance between the Russian orbit and the Atlantic Community. Whether there is to be a third world war in the twentieth century depends upon whether the Russians come to rest within their orbit, the Atlantic states in theirs, and whether they then concert their policies toward Germany and Japan. . . . *I do not say that such a concert of power is a world order of peace.* But I do contend that such a concert must be achieved in order to found a world order." (p. 91, emphasis mine—H.B.)

* * *

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lippmann's Atlantic Community, Inc., stands revealed in its anti-Soviet intent when, in Chapter 11, dealing with the relations of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., our author sharpens anew the old ideological weapons for a crusade against the U.S.S.R. He declares bluntly that if the Soviet Union does not accommodate itself to "western ideas" about democracy then there cannot be close collaboration with it, even if there are no differences on any other questions, even if the Soviet Union should passionately accept the Atlantic Community! He writes:

"As long as this inequality exists [between the internal regime of the western powers and that of the Soviet Union—H.B.] there cannot be true collaboration between the Soviet Union and the Western world. There can only be a *modus vivendi, only compromises, bargains, specific agreements, only a diplomacy of checks and counter-checks.*" (p. 141, emphasis mine—H.B.)

And further:

"We owe it to the Soviet people to say that however correct may be our diplomatic relations, they will not be really the good relations they need to be until the basic political and human liberties are established in the Soviet Union. *Only then will there be full confidence, and a free intercourse on a basis of full equality. For between states that do not have free institutions and those that do have them, international relations must necessarily be special and restricted.*" (p. 148, emphasis mine—H.B.)

If one examines the list of the forty-two states which Lippmann includes in the Atlantic Community it is obvious that he is not very "choosy"; he overlooks the internal regime of many of these nations. But to the Soviet Union he puts, as the precondition for real collaboration, an ultimatum to accept his measurement of democracy. And this in relation to our great ally, the Soviet Union, which can well hold its own where democracy is concerned, and which has also shown since 1917 how it reacts to direct and indirect intervention.

Crusader Lippmann could save himself much trouble before undertaking his démarche for the "democratization" of the Soviet Union, were he to reckon with the Soviet people themselves. How the people of the Soviet Union think about their internal condition, about their socialist democracy, they have proved by their military front and by their home front to the entire world. The people of the Soviet Union are apparently of the opinion that "their basic political and human liberties" are well established in their country. In the land of socialist democracy there is no discrimination or restriction against people because of race; there is no unemployment; there obtain, not only the formal, but also the material conditions of equal opportunity. Soviet civil rights are not hampered by special laws, groups, and interests. Mr. Lippmann may be sorry that the Soviet people have not organized a Republican Party, but apparently the Soviet people

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

didn't consider such a party necessary for their progress.

The gigantic struggle of the people of the Soviet Union against Nazi Germany is the most magnificent historic plebiscite of peoples for their country, their leadership, and their institutions, for their belief in their future.

Mr. Lippmann might well ponder the words of so hard-boiled a leader of American Big Business as Eric Johnston that the continuation and intensification of our relations with the Soviet Union demand the recognition that there shall be no intolerance of one to the other as regards social set-up and political philosophy.

But Lippmann proposes intervention into internal conditions of the U.S.S.R. as a *pre-condition for post-war collaboration.* He invites the Soviet Union, nay, he demands of her to become a party in intervening in the internal conditions of other countries! *He demands that the Soviet Union should participate in a crusade of suppression of all Communist Parties.* He writes:

"Actually it would serve the Russian interests not only to repudiate, as she has already done, international communism, *but to look without disfavor upon the legal outlawry and suppression by democratic states of all revolutionary parties*" (p. 153).

Thus, Lippmann brazenly bares the true character of his future "democratic" community. According to this policy the United States should be the driving force for the suppression of the Communist Parties in the forty-two states of the Atlantic Community and in the entire world. Lippmann even demands that the Soviet Union should support this dirty work. Were Lippmann to become our Secretary of State his envoys and diplomatic agents would intervene everywhere for the suppression of the Communist Parties, in France, in Spain, in Italy, in Belgium, in Yugoslavia, in China and finally also in a Germany liberated from Hitler. How wretched! With all his learning, Lippmann gets no further than a Dies, a Hearst, or a Hamilton Fish!

Naturally, as Secretary of State, Walter Lippmann would with such a policy enter the field of most dangerous adventure if he attempted to become the driving force throughout the world for the suppression of the Communist movement. For the Communist Parties have won the right by their struggle against fascism to play a significant national role in the life of their nations after the war also.

Who would attempt to suppress the Communist Parties in Yugoslavia, in France, in Italy, in Greece, in Norway, in Belgium, etc.? Certainly not democratic forces, but only forces of reaction. In many countries the attempt to suppress the Communist Parties would mean provoking civil war and make impossible the maintenance of democratic institutions. How would Lippmann go about suppressing the Communist Party of France or of Yugoslavia, and whom would he choose as companions in this kind of "democratic" activity?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How would Lippmann attempt, for example, to suppress the Communist Party in China? Lippmann admits that the split between the Kuomintang and the Communists was effected with the help of past policies of the United States. (p. 20) What have been the consequences? A bloody ten-year civil war, a tragic delay in unification and modern development of China, the strengthening of Japan—to the detriment of all the United Nations.

Lippmann refuses to admit that the Communist Parties are not a product of the Soviet Union, but are the product of the conditions in the various countries, and that they will become in many countries, more than ever before, important factors for a policy of long-lasting peace, of the unification of the labor movement, of the establishment of real democratic national fronts, and of social progress for their people. In attempting to direct the foreign policy of the United States along the path of intervention in the internal affairs of other nations, Walter Lippmann would make the United States a supporter, nay, a leader, of the worst international post-war reaction, around whom would rally all defeated fascists, all defeated aggressors, all exiled quislings, all those who can never learn. Such a policy would not only make America hated and detested by the great masses of peoples, it would not only *have its dangerous reactionary consequences internally,* but it would also be inevitably doomed to failure. The Communist Parties, which have withstood the hell of fascism and of war, whose influence has grown mightily as a result of their self-sacrificing boldness and steadfastness, would doubtless also withstand the persecution staged and advocated by the Walter Lippmanns. Lippmann can't do worse to the Communists than Hitler with his quislings has done. Yet him they have withstood. Lippmann would go bankrupt with his policy just as did a certain Herr Metternich in the nineteenth century, only much more rapidly—however, not without tragic consequences for all concerned.

* * *

Walter Lippmann's book shows that the time has come to distinguish not only between isolationists and non-isolationists. There is a non-isolationist policy as represented by Teheran. This is the non-isolationism to which the peoples, governments, and armies of the United Nations stand committed. But we find cropping up in certain circles a non-isolationism which is nothing but *aggressive imperialism* and which attracts the most reactionary isolationist elements. These circles, experiencing the tremendous military and economic power of our country, are ready to become dizzy with success and would like to treat the world as Montgomery Ward in Chicago tried to treat his employees. They would like, so to speak, to substitute for the collective security by United Nations *a company union of nations—"The Atlantic Community."*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RESOLUTIONS

ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE COMMUNIST POLITICAL ASSOCIATION, MAY 20-23, 1944

LATIN AMERICA

[*The Main Resolution, on the Report of Earl Browder, appeared in the June issue, followed by further resolutions in the issues of July and August. With the resolutions published in the present number, the series adopted by the Convention is concluded.—The Editors.*]

1. THE Hitlerite enemy has long been preparing political and military diversions in the Western Hemisphere, in the desperate hope of delaying or disrupting the Anglo-American invasion of Europe and of torpedoing the growing anti-Axis unity of and within the Americas. A center for these operations has been established in Argentina, where the G.O.U. military dictatorship subjects a great democratic people to fascist terror in order to carry on the task assigned it by Berlin. The fascist coups in Bolivia and Paraguay, as well as the happily unsuccessful attempt on the life of the Mexican President, Avila Camacho, have convinced our government that the pro-Axis dictatorship in Argentina—the first completely fascist regime to be established on Latin American soil—has aggressive designs against the peace and security of the hemisphere.

We applaud Secretary Cordell Hull's decision to withhold recognition from the Bolivian junta, and to suspend relations with the Farrell-Peron clique in Buenos Aires. We hope and believe that these steps will be followed by other measures for cooperating with the democratic forces in the continent and withdrawing every semblance of support from such pro-fascist and subversive groups as the Mexican Sinarchists and the agents of the Spanish Falange. To this end the rectification of our relations with Spain is essential, for while Franco remains the link between Hitler and American fascism, the democratic peoples of Latin America are bound by the closest ties of tradition and culture to the Spanish Republicans struggling for the unity and liberation of their fatherland.

2. Labor in the United States, particularly the C.I.O., has made some progress in developing fraternal relations with the Confederation of Latin American Workers—Latin America's great trade union movement. This must be developed further. Friendship and solidarity among the labor and people's movements of all the American republics will serve the national interests of each of them, and the common cause of the United Nations.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. We need to begin planning now for the deepening of the Good Neighbor policy and its projection into the post-war reconstruction period. Rapid industrialization of the Latin American countries, and a rising living standard for their peoples, are indispensable to the maintenance of our own present levels of production. Private industry and government, in conjunction with all the United Nations, must work together in opening up these great new American frontiers. Long-term credits at minimum interest rates, government-underwritten, will be required. Policies and practices of international cartels or of U.S. monopolies which infringe upon the national sovereignty, obstruct the industrial and democratic development, and exploit the peoples of the other American nations must be curbed by inter-American governmental intervention.

4. The maintenance of the Puerto Rican nation in colonial bondage, against the will of its people, is inconsistent with the aims of our national war effort and harmful to our relations with Latin America, as well as the peoples of Asia and Africa. We defend the democratic, social, and economic gains achieved by the Puerto Rican people through the Popular Democratic Party and the trade unions and popular movements. We condemn the efforts of reactionary and defeatist groups in this country to rob them of these gains through reactionary attacks on Governor Tugwell and the Roosevelt Administration. We call upon our government to take immediate steps toward the liberation of Puerto Rico and its recognition as an independent nation and will support all constructive moves which will facilitate this.

5. We hail the Presidents and peoples of Mexico, Cuba and Chile, through whose efforts the great anti-fascist fighter Victorio Codovilla has been freed from the Argentine terror. We urge the government of Chile to sever all relations with Nazi Germany and the Axis. In the interests of the Brazilian nation, which is making such splendid contributions to victory over fascism, and in those of the whole hemisphere, we call upon President Getulio Vargas to release the patriot Luis Carlos Prestes. We ask our own government to use its great influence in behalf of the thousands of labor leaders and anti-fascists imprisoned in Argentina and Paraguay and to help save the lives of hundreds threatened with execution in El Salvador. This will hearten the heroic anti-fascists of all lands, especially in the countries enslaved by the Hitlerites and Japanese. It will bring added strength to the United Nations and peoples.

ANTI-SEMITISM

AS AMERICA gears itself militarily and morally for the great Western invasion of Europe, the pro-fascists are growing daily more desperate. As part of their fifth-column activity they are more intensely resorting to anti-Semitic agitation, with the purpose of confusing, dividing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and weakening our national war effort.

The anti-Semitic assaults and acts of vandalism in Boston, New York, Connecticut, Chicago, and other places were not accidental, disconnected incidents. They were and are the preliminary skirmishes of planned and organized attack: Attack at one and the same time on our Jewish fellow-citizens, and on our national unity and national integrity.

Anti-Semitism is degeneracy, moral, social, and political. It is a weapon in the hands of the most reactionary elements in our society, of the anti-democratic forces, of the *fifth column*, used with the intention of undermining our national unity and of corrupting the moral fibre of the weak and the misled, so that these elements, their ethical sense destroyed by participation in the baiting and assaulting of Jews, may be better tools for the destruction of the liberty of the American people as a whole. This is how the fascists have used anti-Semitism in Germany and this is how the Hitlerite outpost is using anti-Semitism in our country. The fomented anti-Jewish outbreaks are a form of Nazi invasion of America. Like the system of Jim-Crow against Negro citizens, they are a part of the false and anti-scientific Hitlerite theory of a "master race."

The criminal technique of the merchants of anti-Semitism is cynically disclosed in the treason trial at Washington—in the anti-Jewish maneuvers of the indicted to turn from themselves the floodlight of accusation. This arrogance stems from their connections with the defeatist press and the defeatist sections of Congress. It should alarm America that those charged with sedition, in the midst of our war for national preservation, should be able to draw aid and comfort from some in high places who still remain free to work for their defeatist designs.

The vast majority of the American people recognize anti-Semitism for what it is, as an attempt to debase American life, and an endeavor to recreate in our country that Nazi horror from which Europe at long last is about to be freed. The American people reject the fascist slanders against the Jews, who, in the tradition of Haym Solomon during the War for Independence, have played an honorable part in every struggle for the freedom and liberty of our country. In every community in which we live, in factory and in office, in every camp and on every ship, on fighting front and home front, we see our Jewish fellow citizens working, fighting, and dying—heroically, as did bombardier Meyer Levin and thousands of others—in patriotic participation in the war our country is waging against the Axis.

Over the entire land a democratic movement is growing to destroy the Hitlerite anti-Semitic virus. We greet with warmth the formation of the National Committee Against Nazi Persecution and Extermination of the Jews, headed by Justice Frank Murphy—an inter-party, inter-faith, national-unity committee, the leading national center in the fight against anti-Semitism in our country and abroad.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labor especially has recognized in anti-Semitism, as well as in Negro-baiting and Red-baiting, a weapon of fascism for weakening and destroying the working-class organizations, the backbone of anti-fascist national unity. The national bodies of labor—C.I.O., A. F. of L., and Railroad Brotherhoods—have condemned anti-Semitism. We appeal to all trade unionists everywhere to intensify the struggle against the fifth columnist purveyors of racial and religious hatred. We appeal to the miners, with their splendid tradition of labor solidarity, not to permit the defeatist insurrectionist John L. Lewis to pollute the well-springs of labor brotherhood with the Hitlerite sewage of anti-Semitism. It is the duty of the trade union movement to repudiate and rout such confederates of reaction in its ranks.

We urge the indictment and arraignment before the bar of justice of Gerald L. K. Smith, Charles Coughlin and all other fascist ringleaders of anti-Semitism and race hatred. We urge the dissolution of the "America First Party," the "Christian Front," the Ku Klux Klan, and all other such un-American, traitorous organizations in whatever guise they may seek to reconstitute themselves. We urge full support for the speedy passage by Congress of the Lynch Bill (H.R. 2328) to bar from the United States mails all race-defaming matter, and for all further legislation to outlaw anti-Semitism, to make anti-Semitic activities a Federal crime.

Anti-Semitism is anti-Americanism: Its eradication is the concern and task of every American who holds dear the moral fiber of America, the democracy and national freedom of his country. No honorable American can abstain from the battle, no decent man or woman can stand on the sidelines.

At this Convention we pledge to intensify our efforts in cooperation with all other patriotic forces joined in the battle to destroy Hitlerism and the Nazi blight of anti-Semitism in American life.

WAGNER-MURRAY-DINGELL SOCIAL SECURITY BILL
(S. 1161-H.R. 2861)

THE Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill is a vital legislative proposal that unifies, expands and improves existing social security legislation. It is a great step forward toward achieving an adequate national system of social security.

This measure creates a Federal health insurance system. It unifies and extends on a national scale, unemployment insurance. It creates a Federal-State public assistance program. It extends the coverage of social security to include, in the main, the entire working population of the country. It provides social security protection for servicemen. It inaugurates a system of maternity benefits.

This bill should be resolutely

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supported. It should also be strengthened to provide adequate unemployment insurance benefits for the entire period of unemployment.

Passage of this measure is not only vital as a timely measure of post-war adjustment but is equally necessary as immediate war legislation. Cutbacks and preparations for reconverting from war to civilian production are taking place *now* during the war. The eleven million Americans in the armed services, and the millions in war and essential civilian production are vitally concerned that measures be taken now to provide for their security during and after the period of reconversion.

An adequate national social security program enacted now would be a war weapon of democracy—an inspiration for all Americans on all the war fronts, at home and abroad.

It is the responsibility of all Americans and especially of the labor movement to secure the widest understanding of the provisions and effects of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security measure and to organize the full weight of American patriotic will for its early enactment into law.

To this effort this Convention pledges its unqualified support.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HISTORIC DOCUMENTS

STATEMENT ON THE SOVIET UNION'S RELATION TO POLAND

[*Following is the text of the statement of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., published on July 25.*]

THE People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. has been entrusted by the Soviet Government to make the following statement:

The Red Army, successfully advancing, has reached the state frontier between the Soviet Union and Poland.

Pursuing the retreating German armies, Soviet troops, together with the Polish army operating on the Soviet-German front, have crossed the Western Bug River, have crossed the Soviet-Polish frontier and have entered the limits of Poland. Thus a beginning of the liberation of our long-suffering brother Polish people from German occupation has been made.

Soviet troops have entered the limits of Poland filled with one determination: to rout the enemy German armies and to help the Polish people in the task of its liberation from the yoke of the German invaders and of the restoration of an independent, strong, and democratic Poland.

The Soviet Government declares that it considers the military operations of the Red Army on the territory of Poland as operations on the territory of a sovereign, friendly, allied state. In conection with this, the Soviet Government does not intend to establish on the territory of Poland organs of its own administration, considering this the task of the Polish people.

It has decided, in view of this, to conclude with the Polish Committee of National Liberation an agreement on relations between the Soviet Command and the Polish Administration.

The Soviet Government declares that it does not pusue aims of acquiring any part of the Polish territory or of a change of social structure in Poland, and that the military operations of the Red Army on the territory of Poland are dictated solely by military necessity and by the striving to render the friendly Polish people aid in its liberation from German occupation.

The Soviet Government expresses its firm confidence that the fraternal people of the U.S.S.R. and Poland will jointly bring to a conclusion the struggle of liberation against the German invaders and will lay a firm foundation for friendly Soviet-Polish collaboration.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE U.S.S.R. AND THE POLISH COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL LIBERATION

THE Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Polish Committee of National Liberation, desiring that relations between the Soviet Commander-in-Chief and the Polish Administration on the territory of the Polish Republic after the entry of Soviet troops to the territory of Poland be resolved in a spirit of friendship, have concluded the present agreement to the following effect:

Article 1. In the zone of military operations on the territory of Poland after the entry of Soviet troops, supreme power and responsibility in all affairs relating to the conduct of the war for the time necessary for the execution of military operations shall be concentrated in the hands of the Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet troops.

Article 2. On Polish territory liberated from the enemy, the Polish Committee of National Liberation: (a) Sets up and directs in conformity with the laws of the Polish Republic administrative organs which the latter establishes; (b) Carries out measures for the further organization, formation and replenishment of the Polish army; (c) Insures active assistance of organs of the Polish Administration to the Soviet Commander-in-Chief in the execution of military operations by the Red Army and in meeting its requirements and needs during its territory of Poland.

Article 3. Polish military units which are formed on the territory of the U.S.S.R. shall operate on the territory of Poland.

Article 4. Contact between the Soviet Commander-in-Chief and the Polish Committee of National Liberation shall be maintained through the Polish Military Mission.

Article 5. In the zone of direct military operations, contact between Polish administrative organs and the Soviet Commander-in-Chief shall be maintained through the delegate of the Polish Committee of National Liberation.

Article 6. As soon as any part of the liberated territory of Poland ceases to be a zone of direct military operations, the Polish Committee of National Liberation shall fully assume the direction of all affairs of civil administration.

Article 7. All personnel of Soviet troops on the territory of Poland shall be under the jurisdiction of the Soviet Commander-in-Chief. All personnel of the Polish Armed Forces shall be subordinated to Polish military laws and regulations. The civilian population on Polish territory shall also be under the latter jurisdiction, even in cases of crimes committed against Soviet troops, with the exception of crimes committed in the zone of military operations, which shall be under the jurisdiction of the Soviet Commander-in-Chief. In disputable cases the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by mutual agreement between the Soviet Commander-in-Chief and the delegate of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Polish Committee of National Liberation.

Article 8. For the entire duration of joint military operations of Soviet troops and the Polish armed forces, the latter shall be subordinated operationally to the Supreme Command of the U.S.S.R., and in matters relating to organization and personnel to the Chief Command of the Polish Armed Forces.

Article 9. A special agreement shall be concluded as regards financial and economic problems relating to the stay of Soviet troops on the territory of Poland, also relating to Polish armed forces which are being formed on the territory of the U.S.S.R.

Article 10. The present agreement takes effect immediately after it is signed. The agreement is made in two copies, each in the Russian and Polish languages. Both texts are equally valid.

(Signed)

On behalf of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

MOLOTOV

On behalf of the Polish Committee of National Liberation:

OSSUBKA-MORAWSKI

Moscow, July 26, 1944.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Books on American History

THE STRUGGLE FOR AMERICAN FREEDOM:
THE FIRST TWO HUNDRED YEARS

By Herbert M. Morais

Beginning with the English background of American history, this new study traces the settlement and development of the thirteen colonies, the growth of agriculture, commerce and industry, the rise of democratic institutions, the impact of mercantilism, the organization of colonial resistance and the successful fight for independence, ending with the triumph of the democratic forces under Jefferson.

Price $2.25

THE RISE OF THE AMERICAN NATION 1793-1824

By Francis Franklin

Interpreting the main events in the national development of the United States during its early history, this book covers the period from the establishment of the Federal Government in 1789 to the end of Monroe's second administration in 1825. It describes the democratic victory over Federalist reaction led by Jefferson and the national victory over foreign aggression in the War of 1812, concluding with an evaluation of the emergence in 1824 of new party formations reflecting the new economic groupings.

Price $2.00

"BUILDERS OF THE NATION" LIBRARY

Edited by Dr. Philip Foner

Abraham Lincoln: Selections From His Writings
Thomas Jefferson: Selections From His Writings
George Washington: Selections From His Writings

Cloth $.85, Paper $.25

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Sta. D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TEHERAN

Our Path in War and Peace

By EARL BROWDER

"We accepted our review copy as an opportunity to learn at first-hand something about Mr. Browder's own ideas instead of what other people think he thinks. . . . The book has been read from cover to cover—carefully, we believe—and we find ourselves in agreement with every one of his main points. . . . Clear thinking, moderation, true patriotism and vision characterize this small volume that furnishes an excellent foundation for a better understanding of the problems that confront America. It merits wide attention."

Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette

Cloth $1.50, Paper $.35

•

THE HERITAGE OF THE COMMUNIST POLITICAL ASSOCIATION

By ROBERT MINOR

A brilliant study of the history of the Communist movement in the United States from its earliest inception up to the present stage of the great worldwide war of liberation. Tracing the development of working class political organizations through several decades, the author draws the rich conclusions for today of the struggles which led to the creation of the Communist Political Association.

Price $.10

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Sta. D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED